

the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8206. Also, petition of Rose E. Wilson, of Riverside, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8207. Also, petition of Maurice J. Hyde, of Oakland, Calif., and 14 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8208. Also, petition of J. C. Stein, of Del Mar, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8209. Also, petition of H. M. Brinker, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 21 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8210. Also, petition of T. J. Conlin, of Venice, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8211. Also, petition of Harry H. Schiffler, of Covina, Calif., and 10 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8212. Also, petition of Bert J. Egan, of Long Beach, Calif., and 19 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8213. Also, petition of W. N. Dennison, of Sterling, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 13, 1940

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 24, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. William L. Darby, D. D., executive secretary, Washington Federation of Churches, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou art a God of wisdom and might, yet of infinite love and tenderness, so that we may fittingly call

Thee our Heavenly Father. Thou art the creator of the far-flung universe, of which this planet we call the earth is only a very small part. Yet here, living upon it, are human beings with qualities akin to Thine and able in some measure to understand Thy ways and have personal fellowship with Thee. For all these gifts and graces, as well as Thy constant care, accept today our grateful thanks.

Yet men, born for brotherhood in Thy great family, have broken that fellowship, and, in a spirit of selfishness and ill-will, are again in the midst of a great war. Forgive them for what they are doing, and forgive us for any spirit of hatred and unbrotherliness which may be in our hearts. Out of this wrong ambition and dependence upon force of arms bring even yet some good. Give Thy sympathy and comfort to bleeding hearts and shattered lives everywhere, and help us to minister to their needs.

Thy blessing we seek upon our own land, upon the President, the Vice President, the Members of this Senate, and other leaders of the Nation. May they continue to pray and work for peace even in these dark and tragic days. Grant that America may be the instrument in Thy hands for aiding men to see a better way of living together in amity and good will. Use us, each and all, high and low, for the beneficent purposes of Thy kingdom, the reign of justice and righteousness, of peace and friendship over the world.

All this we ask in the name of Him who is the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, May 9, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6965) for the relief of Stina Anderson.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 200) to provide for participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition at San Francisco in 1940, to continue the powers and duties of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 217) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes," approved July 9, 1937, to provide for participation in the New York World's Fair, 1940, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 6264. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6965. An act for the relief of Stina Anderson;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the establishment of Greenwich, Conn., as a town;

H. R. 8319. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and for the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 519. Joint resolution to suspend section 510 (g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, during the present European war, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lee	Sheppard
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Ashurst	Frazier	Lucas	Slatery
Austin	George	Lundeen	Smathers
Bailey	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Blibo	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] is absent from the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT and Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

GOLDEN GATE EXPOSITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 200) to provide for participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition at San Francisco in 1940, to continue the powers and duties of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That in order that the United States may continue its participation in the Golden Gate International Exposition of San Francisco, Calif., in 1940, the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the world's fair to be held by the San Francisco Bay Exposition, Inc., in the city of San Francisco during the year 1939, and for other purposes", approved July 9, 1937, as amended by this joint resolution, is extended and made applicable to the continuance of the participation of the United States in such exposition in 1940 in the same manner and to the same extent and for the same purposes as originally provided in such joint resolution of July 9, 1937.

Sec. 2. Section 6 of such joint resolution of July 9, 1937, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Commission when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$500."

Sec. 3. The second proviso of the first paragraph of section 7 of such joint resolution of July 9, 1937, is amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That the Commission may, if it deems it desirable and in the public interest, transfer, with or without consideration, the title to the Federal exhibits building or buildings or other Commission-owned property to the city and county of San Francisco or to any Federal, State, or local governmental agency."

Sec. 4. In addition to the sum of \$1,500,000 authorized by such joint resolution of July 9, 1937, to be appropriated for the participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition and appropriated by the Third Deficiency Appropriation

Act, fiscal year 1937, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200,000 for participation in 1940.

Sec. 5. The act entitled "An act to authorize the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission to produce and sell certain articles, and for other purposes", approved June 15, 1938, is hereby extended and made applicable during the participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition in 1940.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. While the amendment of the House of Representatives is not wholly satisfactory, time is of the essence, and I move, therefore, that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 217) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939, authorizing an appropriation therefor and for other purposes," approved July 9, 1937, to provide for participation in the New York World's Fair, 1940, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, to strike out all of section 3, and on page 2, line 19, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Mr. MEAD. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Interior, and the Army, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolution memorializing Congress to pass the Wheeler-Jones bill scaling down farm mortgages and reducing the interest rate

Whereas the farm-mortgage problem is one of great importance to the American people, and particularly to Mississippi, where so large a portion of the people are engaged in agriculture; and

Whereas, of the 6,000,000 farms in the United States, 2,350,000 are mortgaged in an aggregate amount of approximately \$7,000,000,000; and

Whereas on March 26, 1940, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace stated that about 25 percent of the farm-mortgage debt of the country is either delinquent or has had the payments due a year ago extended; and that on January 1, 1940, a total of 139,369, or 22½ percent of the Federal land-bank loans were delinquent or had their installments extended; and

Whereas the Wheeler-Jones bill provides for a scaling down of farm mortgages and a permanent reduction of interest and gives the present occupant of a farm an opportunity to rehabilitate himself on the present farm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi memorialize the Congress of the United States to bring to successful passage this legislation, known as S. 3509 and H. R. 8748, being companion measures, in order that the benefits of this act may be extended to the farmers of the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate in Washington, and the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Mississippi delegation in Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Casper (Wyo.) Trades Assembly, protesting against any changes in the so-called Wagner National Labor Relations Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Mission Provision Co., of San Antonio, Tex., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1970, the so-called La Follette civil liberties bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Presbytery of Chester in session at Glen Olden, Pa., discountenancing the action of the President in appointing a representative at the

Vatican, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the prompt enactment of the so-called Wagner-Van Nuys-Capper antilynching bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of the Women's National Aeronautical Association of the United States, signed by its national president, remonstrating against adoption of the President's Reorganization Plan No. IV, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America (affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, of Detroit, Mich., and Chrysler Local, No. 371, International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, of New Castle, Ind., favoring the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 591) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition numerously signed by veterans of the World War, of Wadsworth, Kans., praying for the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Van Nuys-Capper antilynching bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FREIGHTERS TO PANAMANIAN REGISTRY

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, at this time I wish to read into the RECORD a telegram received by me from H. F. McGrath, president of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. The telegram reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 9, 1940.

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,

Senate Merchant Marine Committee:

The Maritime Federation of the Pacific is resolutely opposed to the request filed by Matson Navigation Co. with the Maritime Commission yesterday to allow transfer of freighters *Mana* and *Makawao* to Panamanian registry to evade Neutrality Act. These vessels, chartered to Canadian firm, employ 100-percent union crews at present. If transfer is approved, American seamen would lose their jobs and the Maritime Commission would be countenancing an open evasion of Neutrality Act. Urge you investigate and act to block this transfer.

MARITIME FEDERATION OF THE
PACIFIC,
H. F. McGRATH, President.

EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, with the names attached, and appropriately referred, a very brief petition signed by sundry citizens of Missouri, in behalf of the so-called equal-rights amendment.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the attached signatures, as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1940.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: We, the undersigned, do implore you to aid in the immediate adoption, in our Constitution of the United States, of the equal-rights amendment. It reads:

"Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

Genevieve Thomas Wheeler, 3874 East Sixty-third Street; Alletta Imes, 2404 East Sixty-ninth Terrace; Edna Virginia Crum, 3215 Forest; Leland Ada Dunnuck, 3929 Central Street; Edna Mary Jackson, 6109 Jackson Avenue; Adeline Howard, 1014 McAlpine; Ida Louella Fitchie, 3536 Bales Avenue; Gertrude McClure, 7426 Wayne; Betty Denny, 2204 East Seventieth Street; Frances Ogelvie 4223 East Sixtieth Terrace; Betty V. Calvin, 5233 Highland; Florence Willyard, Studio Building; Eva Falk Kentz, Ninety-ninth and Blue Ridge; Margaret Pinkard, 5613 Bales; Frances M. Wenne, 3928 East Fifty-eighth; Virginia Williamson, 7310 Park; Helen M. Wolf, 4555 Main; Ufa Chiarelli, 2403 East Sixty-ninth Terrace; Esther B. Laude, 2228 East Sixty-ninth Terrace; Virginia Gibson, 2231 East Sixty-ninth Terrace; Mrs. C. J. Dittmore, 3826 East Sixty-third Street; Helen Dittmore, 3826 East Sixty-third Street; Mrs. W. Bullard, 4230 East Sixty-third Street; Mrs. G. Hallauer, 4214 East Sixty-third Street; Benita Benson, 3890 East Sixty-third; Ruth L. Benson, 3888 East Sixty-third Street; E. S. Welty, 3866 East Sixty-third Street; Edna A. Thornton, 3842 East Sixty-third Street; Chas. Knapp, 3834

East Sixty-third; Marietta Knapp, 3834 East Sixty-third; Beulah E. Wilson, 3830 East Sixty-third Street; Bertha R. Lightburne, 3874 East Sixty-third Street; Emma T. Coyle, 4144 Locust; Meldred A. Coyle, 4144 Locust; Mrs. Jennie Vogt, 3929 Central.

WORLD CRISIS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD and appropriately referred two letters received today in the same mail from two of my former colleagues in the New Jersey State Senate—one from Senator Toolan of Middlesex County and the other from Senator Erickson of Cumberland County, addressed to the President of the United States.

These letters are both on the important subject of the world crisis in Europe and what America's reaction should be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

PERTH AMBOY, N. J., May 10, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Some months ago I started to dictate a letter to you, expressing some of my views in the matter of preparedness. I never mailed the letter, because I felt you were sufficiently bothered by other constituents and I should not add my tale of woe to the many others that must come across your desk daily. I think world affairs justify certain reasonable conclusions such as:

(1) There is no such thing as international honor or morality.
(2) We are living in an age when it is utterly impossible to accept the solemn pledges, covenants, or assurances of any of the dictatorial powers.

(3) We have reverted to the law of the jungle, and power, force, and might have supplemented right, justice, and a decent regard for others.

(4) Superior power and force are the only things that the mad dogs that now dominate some governments respect.

I realize that many naval and military authorities contend that no foreign force could successfully land a sizeable expeditionary force upon the American Continent. This probably represents their honest opinion. Lawyers frequently give opinions to their clients, but when the court of last resort speaks to the contrary the opinion is meaningless and the opinion may have been the means of causing great harm to the client, who acted honestly on the basis of that opinion. The opinion of military and naval experts, that is founded upon nothing more substantial than the observation of a great minstrel that the "two best friends of the United States are the Atlantic and the Pacific," is not sufficient security for me in these times. Wherefore, Bill, I believe:

(a) That America should proceed at once to build up an Army of 1,000,000 men.

(b) That this Army should be organized for modern warfare and not upon the old cumbersome basis of the World War.

(c) That this Army should be equipped with the best motorized devices known to modern inventive genius. It should be schooled in the philosophy of the blitzkrieg. Recent happenings in Poland and Norway demonstrate that it is useless to stack mortal man with a rifle against steel in the form of tanks and high-powered armored cars.

(d) That we should have the greatest air force in the world.

(e) That on the Atlantic seaboard our Navy should have an abundance of light, fast craft. If England wins this war, we will not need battleships on the Atlantic seaboard. If she loses the war, Germany has few heavily armored ships. Of course, we need the big battleships in the Pacific because Japan's Navy is intact.

I am not posing as a military or naval strategist. I do, however, firmly believe that every dollar invested in preparedness at this time represents an insurance premium which we must pay for future security.

The people back home are thinking seriously of these matters. I am certain that they will support and sustain our representatives in Washington who insist upon complete preparation for every eventuality. The Government in England was caught napping. Every street urchin can now tell wise men of England what they should have done. What England should have done, but failed to do a few years ago, must be done by us today, or a year or so hence we may look more foolish than England does today.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. TOOLAN.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

BRIDGETON, N. J., May 10, 1940.

United States Senator SMATHERS,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: This may be somewhat presumptuous upon my part, but world affairs have reached the stage where I think decent people ought to speak, and I am sending you enclosed herewith a copy of a letter which I am today mailing to the President.

May I say to you that if I were in your place I would forthwith introduce in the United States Senate a resolution calling upon the President to sever all diplomatic relations with all powers in the world who have in the past assumed an aggressive attitude toward their neighbors. They have nothing we want, and as an individual I refuse to sanction the sale of scrap iron to Japan to kill off Chinese or to lend to Germany or Italy our moral support in the things that they are doing to the rest of the world.

Very truly yours,

LINWOOD W. ERICKSON.

BRIDGETON, N. J., May 10, 1940.

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You may class me as a fool, and, after all, that probably will make little difference.

However, I want to say that in civilian life we banish from society outright liars. At least they are banished to the extent that other people refuse to trust them, or have confidence in them in any way, and it seems to me we are fast approaching a state when the practices which we adopt in civilian life are applied in international relations.

While I am absolutely opposed to the United States entering into an armed conflict—and may I pause to say that three of four brothers were in the last one—I think it is time that the United States Government took a definite stand in the present European conflict.

It is quite evident that the word of the totalitarian powers cannot be taken, and they certainly have nothing that we need or want, and I am strongly in favor of breaking off all diplomatic relations, and all commerce treaties, with any power who takes an aggressive attitude toward any other power.

This may be considered as a breach of neutrality by some, but to me it is a question of common decency, and I think the sooner certain totalitarian powers are given to understand that there are some decent people in the world, with a high conception of moral principles applied to an international situation, by our refusing to have any relations with them at all, they will at least recognize that their position is not secure.

May I say that the breaking off of public relations with Germany to me is highly advisable, in view of the aggressions of which they are guilty, and I believe such a procedure would awaken the common sense embodied in the masses of the German people.

I am not exactly an amateur, having served 12 years in an executive position, served 3 years in the New Jersey Senate, and sat alongside of United States Senator SMATHERS during that time, and for 3 years have been on the bench, and to me it is definitely time for the United States Government to take a more definite stand in world affairs than we have in the past.

I might say to you that I have always been an advocate of the League of Nations, whose decrees were not to be enforced by an army, but economic sanction, and that is what I am now advocating so far as the present situation is concerned. I am strongly convinced that the trouble with the world affairs today is the wholesale conspiracy entered into by the Republican Senators against Woodrow Wilson, which kept us out of the League of Nations.

The totalitarians had their growth in other countries, and with absolute security Mussolini marched into Ethiopia, while everybody else sat by complacently and permitted him to do it. An economic sanction at that time would have seriously interfered with his program, and probably have kept him from carrying it out. Following Ethiopia, the other world powers sat by and saw Spain invaded by a foreign army, which to me was the most diabolical thing which has ever happened. I do not care what form of government exists within a given country, but I am seriously concerned when a foreign power attempts to dictate the internal policies of another country. After these two programs were put over, we find Mussolini invading Albania, and Germany putting the iron heel upon all of the peace-loving countries of Europe.

If this world catastrophe is to be stopped, it is time we, as a world power, took cognizance of what is going on and refuse by severing trade relations to give these powers our passive sanction.

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to United States Senator SMATHERS, with whom, as I said before, I sat in the New Jersey Senate for 3 years.

Very truly yours,

LINWOOD W. ERICKSON.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3686) to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to create a public corporate authority to undertake slum clearance and projects to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income and to issue bonds and other obligations of the authority for such purpose, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1582) thereon.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7811) to establish the Hot

Springs division of the western judicial district of Arkansas, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1583) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3464) to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended, reported it without amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3223) for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1584) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3649) for the relief of Harry D. Gann, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1585) thereon.

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3683) to remove the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9013) to transfer Harde-man County, Tex., from the Fort Worth division to the Wichita Falls division of the northern judicial district of Texas, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1586) thereon.

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) authorizing the temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of a painting of the scene at the signing of the Constitution, and the holding of ceremonies in connection therewith (reported by Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library on the 6th instant), reported it without amendment.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 265, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 265) submitted by Mrs. CARAWAY on May 2, 1940, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 213, agreed to April 10, 1940, authorizing the Committee on Enrolled Bills to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the remainder of the present session, is hereby amended to include the time from the beginning of the session to the date of adoption of the said resolution.

VIOLA FINLEY

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 267, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 267) submitted by Mr. SMATHERS on May 7, 1940, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Viola Finley, widow of Harry I. Finley, late clerk in the office of Senator SMATHERS, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

OLIVER WENDALL HOLMES MEMORIAL FUND (S. DOC. NO. 197)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit for appropriate disposition the report of the committee appointed under Public Resolution No. 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session (C. 595, 52 Stat. 943). This report contains the committee recommendations concerning the use of the bequest and devise made to the United States by the late Mr. Justice Holmes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as a document.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 3962. A bill for the relief of the Louis Puccinelli Bail Bond Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3963. A bill for the relief of Catherine Greening; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3964. A bill granting a pension to Earnest Hill Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 3965. A bill for the relief of Julia Neville;

S. 3966. A bill for the relief of Peter Konotopko; and

S. 3967. A bill for the relief of the Cold Spring Brewing Co., of Cold Spring, Minn., and the Schuster Brewing Co., of Rochester, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3968. A bill providing for acquisition of privately owned lands in the Superior National Forest and the Kabetogama and Grand Portage Purchase Units; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 3969. A bill for the relief of Meier Langermann, his wife, Friederike, and son, Joseph; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 3970. A bill relating to the residence requirements for persons appointed to the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

S. 3971 (by request). A bill to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or in any national park or forest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 3972. A bill to authorize exchanges of lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 3973. A bill for the relief of E. B. Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3974. A bill to clarify section 3709 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to make temporary emergency provision for the determination of foreign construction costs under section 502 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Commerce.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR STUDY OF THE TELEGRAPH INDUSTRY

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 268), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 95, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, agreed to June 19, 1939, directing a study of the telegraph industry and certain other matters, is hereby continued in full force and effect during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Committee on Interstate Commerce is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during such sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods, the amounts authorized for said purposes.

DRAFT OF WEALTH IN TIME OF WAR—NOTICE BY SENATOR LEE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, at this time I give notice that it is my intention at the first opportunity to press for consideration of Calendar No. 474, Senate bill 1650, a bill to promote peace and the national defense through a more equal distribution of the burdens of war by drafting the use of money according to ability to lend to the Government.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO EIGHTH AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the

United States to the Eighth American Scientific Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO KING LEOPOLD

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1940, entitled "Roosevelt Tells King Leopold United States Hopes for Belgian Victory," which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDEMNATION BY POPE PIUS XII OF ATTACK ON BELGIUM, HOLLAND AND LUXEMBURG

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1940, entitled "Pope Condemns Nazi Attacks on Low Countries," which appears in the Appendix.]

A WORLD IN FLAMES—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 12, 1940, entitled "A World in Flames," which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY WALLACE BEFORE IOWA DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. HERRING asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, at the opening of the Iowa Democratic State Convention at Des Moines, Iowa, on May 11, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT 75 YEARS OF NEGRO PROGRESS EXPOSITION

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the 75 Years of Negro Progress Exposition, at Detroit, Mich., on May 12, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

INEQUALITY BETWEEN FARM AND NONFARM INCOME

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun relating to the inequality between the farm and nonfarm income, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from O. R. McGuire, chairman of the special committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association, published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 12, 1940, with reference to the Logan-Walter bill for the regulation of administrative procedure, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE PREPARATIONS

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Omaha Morning World-Herald of May 11, 1940, entitled "Wake Up, America!" which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DR. C. L. NELSON AT ROCHESTER, MINN.

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Dr. C. L. Nelson, Democratic chairman of the First Congressional District, at Rochester, Minn., on April 29, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN LEGION PROGRAM OF WORLD PEACE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Legion, relating to the Legion's program of world peace and foreign relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY E. G. B. RILEY ON HOME-DEFENSE FORCE

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by E. G. B. Riley on the subject of a home-defense force, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LYNCHLESS YEAR—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 12, 1940, entitled "A Lynchless Year," which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITION OF THE ARMY AND FORMULATION OF A MILITARY POLICY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement to the Senate relating to the condition of the United States Army as facts have become available to those of us on the subcommittee on military appropriations who have been studying the matter. My statement will be so brief that it will not lay proper stress on the qualities of the Army and on its good points, which is something I should like to do, because it is always human nature to stress deficiencies.

I think it is not to be argued that there is a very able officer corps in our Army and that all members of the committee who heard them were very much impressed with the personnel, from General Marshall down. In what I am going to say also I want it understood that I have the highest admiration and regard both for the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I was once a member, and the chairman of the subcommittee on military appropriations, a member of which I now happen to be. Certainly the fairness and patriotism with which they have approached this problem is very commendable.

The fact remains, however, that our Army today is not what it ought to be. We have a Regular force of 223,000 and a National Guard of 200,000, making a total of 423,000 men. But at the present time we have weapons for only 75,000. That is, counting tanks, semiautomatic rifles, machine guns, antitank and antiaircraft guns, field artillery, and other such essentials for a modern army, we could at this moment put in the field fully equipped only an army of 75,000 men, and if we had suddenly to procure sufficient weapons for an army of 400,000 we would be confronted by delay which might last anywhere from 15 to 18 months, a delay which, of course, under modern war conditions, with the science of war moving as fast as it does, might be disastrous. The effect of this kind of a delay on the fortunes of Great Britain in the current European war has, I think, impressed us all.

If we had to remedy this deficiency in weapons, we not only should be confronted with the problem that we have not the necessary plants in which to produce these weapons, but we also have not a sufficient number of personnel who know how to make them. In other words, a nation may be the richest nation on the face of the earth—as we are supposed to be—and still find that there are things that money cannot buy; and human skill and experience are among the things that cannot be bought by the yard. At the present moment we are suffering from the apathy which has been a general condition regarding our national defense since the World War, and we are faced with the fact that our principal bottle neck is in having men who know how to make the required weapons.

Mr. President, a similar condition will be found to exist insofar as the air force is concerned. The Air Corps at the present time tell me that they could not use larger appropriations than are now carried in the bill, because if they got more airplanes than are now provided, they could not furnish pilots for them, and they cannot educate and train any more pilots than they are now training without running into a grave risk of loss of lives, because the number of teachers is so limited. The number of instructors who are qualified to teach flying cadets is so small that, if we should start increasing the pupils, it would be necessary to spread the instruction so thin that in all probability some boys would lose their lives. In other words, here again we are faced with the fact that we have not skilled personnel in sufficiently large numbers and that we cannot improvise that kind of training on short notice. We can build another Kelly Field or Brooks Field or Randolph Field—we can build them certainly—but we cannot pull out of a silk hat the additional instructors who are necessary.

I understand that if a nation were to endeavor to create an air force of 25,000 pilots under present conditions it would have to allow 2 years to do so, because it would be necessary to subject 150,000 boys to physical examination before selecting the ones who measure up to the very stringent qualifications; and then, if they are to have safe and sound instruction, there cannot very well be more than five pupils to a teacher. That means between 5,000 and 6,000 instructors. Where are

we going to get them? The only place we can get them is out of the front line; and if we should take 6,000 men out of the front line of our air service in a war, what would happen to our defense?

I merely point that out to show the terrible dilemma in which a nation finds itself when it leaves these things until the last minute. We can leave the provision for many quartermaster items to the last minute, because we make such items in time of peace anyway; but we cannot improvise on short notice the human skill that fights these weapons, or the human skill that manufactures them.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I understand, then, the Senator is urging that we step up our facilities for training pilots, and for building planes. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. No; it cannot be done during the next fiscal year.

Mr. LEE. Does the Senator favor doing it?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have it done when it can be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. When can it be done?

Mr. LEE. If the Senator will allow me an observation, I should like to have it done now. I should like to see immediately launched a program providing for training not 5,000 pilots but 250,000 pilots.

Mr. LODGE. Whom would the Senator use for instructors?

Mr. LEE. That is the trouble. I think the Senator from Massachusetts was present in the committee when I asked General Arnold why we could not have instructors placed in a number of military academies which are asking for instructors, and his answer was that we did not have a sufficient number, which only emphasizes what the Senator from Massachusetts is saying, and what I believe, that we find ourselves in a very weak position, so far as the air is concerned.

If the Senator will be kind enough to yield further, up until now we have been told in the committees by the generals of the Army and the admirals of the Navy that the air force is merely an auxiliary; but Germany has used the air arm of its military force as the spearhead of its "blitzkrieg."

Mr. LODGE. I should like to complete my statement. I think there is much truth in what the Senator from Oklahoma says, but it is such a large subject that I do not think he could cover it within the space of time I am prepared to yield. If he is saying that the present European war has thrown an entirely new light and new emphasis on aviation, I heartily agree with him; but during the coming fiscal year—and it is surprising to me, as I think it is surprising to a number of other Senators—during the fiscal year ending July 1, 1941, which is the period with which we are now concerned, we could not increase the training of our pilots without great risk of incurring a casualty rate which, of course, we would not be justified in doing in time of peace.

Mr. President, those are two major considerations; but everybody today is asking himself other questions. We are asking ourselves the question, What should be our antiaircraft policy? I suppose it is no secret that of the new 90-millimeter gun which has been invented we have no supply at all. We have merely a few pilot models. We have only about 400 3-inch guns, though I suppose that around the great cities of Europe there are several thousand of such guns. So the question arises, What should be our antiaircraft policy?

When we come to the question of producing these difficult items, we know that in Europe nations set up what are known as shadow plants—plants which are set up with all the necessary machinery and equipment, and then locked up until war comes, when they are opened, and at once the nations get large-scale production of these weapons. That is something for us to consider. It is the only way in which we shall avoid a terrible delay when an emergency arises.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator spoke of the time required for preparation of the Air Corps; and then he spoke of the new 90-millimeter guns, and the fact that we have only a few of them at this time. What is the period of production of such guns?

Mr. LODGE. I am unable to give it accurately. Such heavy items of ordnance take more than a year.

Mr. BRIDGES. That could not be done, either, during the fiscal year?

Mr. LODGE. No; it could not.

Then we ought to ask ourselves the question, What kind of an Army do we want? What is the area which we want to protect? Do we want to have an Army that can protect continental United States? Of course we do. Do we want to have an Army that we will send to Europe? Of course we do not. We are not going to develop an Army for that purpose. Do we want an Army that can defend continental United States and prevent a foreign power from establishing itself either in the Caribbean area or in the North Atlantic area? I contend that we do want such an Army. I contend that we should have an Army that would be able to do that even if the fleet were in the Pacific and the Panama Canal were destroyed.

Those are important considerations, not only important to the Army and to the Congress, but the questions involved ought to be widely understood and proposals to meet the conditions should be approved by the American people.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator expresses a desire to have an Army sufficient to defend North America and the West Indies. How much of an Army does the Senator think would be required to do that?

Mr. LODGE. Without the fleet?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am accepting the Senator's proposition. What does the Senator think? How much of an Army and what kind of an Army would be required to do that?

Mr. LODGE. I can only give my own guess.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is on the Military Committee, and we are looking to him to advise the Senate about these matters, and he seems willing to advise them to a certain extent. I should like to go the whole way, because those of us who know nothing about these subjects are anxious to provide whatever military and naval force is necessary to secure these very desirable and patriotic objectives. Now, I should like the Senator to tell us.

Mr. LODGE. I am immeasurably flattered by what the Senator from Texas says, because he is not one of those who hand out compliments indiscriminately. The purpose of my speech, when I come to the conclusion of it, is to point out the fact that none of us knows sufficient about these things, and that we ought to have an investigation of them; but my guess, for what it is worth—and it is merely one man's guess—is that with the fleet being in the Atlantic, an army of 450,000 men—that is, the initial protective force—if it were equipped, could take care of that situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator, then, favors increase of the Army at the present time to 450,000 men?

Mr. LODGE. I favor providing the weapons for that number of men, because, of course, it does not do us any good to have the men if we have not the weapons.

Mr. CONNALLY. On the other hand, it does not do us any good to have the weapons unless we have the men.

Mr. LODGE. No; but the men are there, and the weapons are not.

Mr. CONNALLY. The men are not trained.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely want to find out what the Senator advises us to do, because, as one Senator and one citizen, I want the United States now—not next year, or 3 years from now, or 10 years from now, but now—to start establishing a sufficient military and naval defense armament—men, munitions, and everything else—to protect the United States and all the contiguous territories in the Western Hemisphere if it becomes necessary so to do.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator from Texas, and I am very grateful to him for rising and making his statement, and lending the weight of his influence to this proposal, because I think he is absolutely correct.

Today, Mr. President, we have what is called a skeleton army. It is not even a complete skeleton, because many ribs are not in it. We have not been approaching the Army problem and thinking about it from a proper standpoint. None of us here would vote for the appropriation of money for a battleship, for instance, without giving it all the clerks, and radio operators, and doctors, and other personnel it needs; but years go by and we set up the various Army corps, which correspond roughly to battleships, and we call them into existence without the medical personnel or any of the corps troops essential to make them complete units.

We have to change and improve and modernize our thinking in military matters. I do not believe we can ever go back to the lax condition which has obtained. I submit that we should continue every year having concentrations such as are now being held along the Sabine River, because an army which does not get together and train as an army is bound to be as incompetent and as unequal to the task which confronts it as the Navy would be if it did not train as a fleet.

We hear a great deal about the cost of these things, and, of course, the cost, when measured by the standards of one individual, are very high, and in this country the cost of making things is relatively high; but I should like to point out—and I have a table before me which I shall ask later to have inserted in the RECORD—that, taking the year 1938, the cost of the national defense was only 5.8 percent of the total cost of all our governments—Federal, State, and local.

Putting it into terms of national income, for the year 1938 the cost of our national defense amounted to 1.47 percent of the national income, compared with the cost of the British national defense which, although inadequate, as we now see, amounted to 5.37 percent of their national income. The French national defense cost 6.36 percent of the national income; the Italian national defense cost more than 13 percent of the national income; and the Japanese national defense cost 30 percent of the national income. I have no figures for Germany.

Mr. President, I ask to have the table to which I have been referring inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States	
National-defense expenditures, ¹ fiscal year 1938.....	\$1,015,527,083
Total cost of Federal, State, and local governments, fiscal year 1938.....	\$17,470,000,000
Cost of national defense in percent of total governmental costs.....	5.81

¹ Includes expenditures for Navy and military and departmental for Army; excludes rivers and harbors, Panama Canal, and other nonmilitary items.

	National income	Appropriations, national defense	National defense in percent of national income
United States, 1938.....	\$63,993,000,000	\$942,335,183	1.47
United Kingdom, 1938.....	26,600,000,000	1,428,079,000	5.37
France, 1938.....	11,500,000,000	731,501,000	6.36
Italy, 1938.....	5,200,000,000	712,100,000	13.69
Germany, 1938.....	32,000,000,000		
Japan, 1939.....	5,300,000,000	1,600,850,347	30.20

Figures for United States only for fiscal year 1939:

Preliminary estimates for 1939 on national income.....	\$68,500,000,000.00
National-defense appropriations for fiscal year 1939.....	\$1,018,576,998.00
National defense in percent of national income, 1939.....	1.49

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Does the Senator have available the percentage of the income of the Government which is going into

its national defense? As I gather, the Senator's figures are based upon a hypothetical figure of national income—not actual Government income.

Mr. LODGE. I have the figures as to the cost of our national defense in percentages of total governmental costs—that is, Federal, State, and local—and the figure is 5.81 percent.

Mr. ADAMS. That still does not answer my question. What percentage of the Federal Government income is going into national defense?

Mr. LODGE. I have not the figure.

Mr. ADAMS. More than one-third of the Federal income is going into national defense.

Mr. LODGE. But it is 5 percent of what the people spend for Government as a whole.

I was about to conclude. I have stated only a few of the fundamental considerations to which none of us, I think, has the answers today, and which indicate that, in the broad and fundamental sense of the word, we have not a military policy. We have our National Defense Act of 1920, which, of course, falls under the shadow of the thought of the World War—a type of military thought which, I submit, is very different from the type of military thought which prevails today. Our military policy, so far as I have observed it, has been whatever the individuals who happen to be in the General Staff and the individuals who happen to be in official positions in Congress feel it should be for any given year, but there is nothing that is widely understood and approved by the people—there is nothing that is as definite and as far-reaching and as thorough as it should be.

I think we want an army adequate to keep us at peace; we want an army so large and so strong that the totalitarian nations, who understand only the language of force, will look at the United States and say, "It will not pay us to molest the United States." That may not seem to be a very high-flown type of argument, but I believe it is the only type of argument which appeals to certain individuals in the world today who are making so much trouble for the human race.

We have tried throughout our history to keep at peace by being unprepared, and I submit it has not worked. We tried it at the time of the World War; we tried it before that time; but, in spite of our attempts, because of our unpreparedness, our country has had a war on an average of nearly every 30 years. I submit it is about time we tried the other systems, of being so manifestly well prepared that no nation will want to molest us.

Mr. President, for that reason I should like to present a concurrent resolution, which calls for a special joint committee, to be composed of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, to formulate a military policy for the United States, then to ascertain the facts regarding our present condition, and make recommendations to Congress for any legislation which may be necessary, and any appropriations which may be needed. That is something which our present committees are not set up to handle. My thought is that, of course, the members of the select committee should come from the Committee on Military Affairs and the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling military appropriations.

Mr. President, I present the concurrent resolution, and ask that it lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and lie on the table.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a special joint committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is authorized and directed to (1) formulate a military policy for the United States, (2) ascertain facts regarding the present condition of the United States Army with respect to its ability to carry out such policy, and (3) report to the Congress not later than January 3, 1941, recommendations for any legislation, including appropriations, deemed necessary in order to carry out such policy. A vacancy in the special joint committee

shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The special joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

For the purposes of this resolution the special joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-sixth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$ shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am in thorough accord with the general remarks made by the Senator from Massachusetts; in fact, I am entirely happy that we have a new recruit on the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate who takes exactly the same view I have taken for the past 5 or 6 years, namely, that we should increase our appropriations for national defense. I think the members of the committee will testify that there has been no one on the committee who has been more willing to vote for increased appropriations for national defense than I have been. But I cannot agree with the Senator's proposal that a special committee is necessary for the consideration of this problem.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thought the Senator from Massachusetts had the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. The members of the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and the House formulated the National Defense Act, which the Senator suggests now needs modification, and those committees are perfectly capable of handling that subject and doing whatever may be necessary at this time. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives is made up of men who serve almost exclusively on that committee and devote practically all their time to it; and we have almost the same situation in the Senate. It is not necessary to create a small special committee for this purpose, when we have regularly constituted committees to carry on the work. I cannot agree with the Senator that a special committee is necessary.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has pretty well covered his point.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to say a word in reply to the Senator from Arizona.

I may say that one of our committees deals with appropriations, and if the members of the committee get the idea that some legislation is necessary, they cannot do anything about it. The other committee does not control the purse strings. In view of those two conditions, I think the subject should be considered by one committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have just read an article by a famous reporter, Thomas L. Stokes, about the need for a thorough survey of our Army forces, published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of today; also an editorial entitled "Inventory Needed," published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of today; and an article by Raymond Clapper entitled "Let's Take Stock," which refers to my proposal for a resolution to investigate the national defense, and it asks:

Will the fact that a Republican takes the initiative kill the idea again? Or is partisanship to be brushed aside?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles and the editorial be printed at the conclusion of my remarks made earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair).
Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles and editorial are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 13, 1940]

THOROUGH OVERHAUL URGED FOR UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Congress will hear this week demands for a thorough recheck of our Military Establishment, both Army and Navy, with the object of revising and overhauling it to meet modern defense and tactical problems developed by the Norwegian and Holland-Belgium campaigns in Europe.

Senator LODGE (Republican, Mass.) will introduce a resolution calling for creation of special joint committees, one to look into the Army, the other into the Navy, selected from the Appropriations, Military, and Naval Committees of the Senate and House.

His proposal is that the committees shall work steadily to explore the national defense and lay down a policy to meet present-day conditions.

With particular reference to the Army, Senator LODGE said:

"We have no military policy. It is just what Congress may say it is from time to time. We must have a definite policy based on the realities of today."

Senator CONNALLY (Democrat, Tex.), a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, emphasized the need of an inquiry into the Navy, particularly as affects the relative importance of sea and air power, to make sure that the lavish naval appropriations are spent in the best interests of national defense.

"If this country doesn't have the best navy in the world," he said, it must be "because the naval officers have not kept up with the best and newest ideas and designs and improvement, since Congress has appropriated generously."

"Sometimes," he added, "the admirals seem to suffer from what is called mental fatigue. And, apparently, some of them are allergic to new ideas."

CONGRESS SHOULD DO IT

Both Senators favor inquiry by Congress rather than by an outside board on which Army and Navy officers and civilians would be represented, as has been suggested in some quarters. Senator CONNALLY said emphatically that the responsibility is that of Congress. Senator LODGE pointed out the danger of friction in outside boards and said that congressional committees which have handled defense problems can work more effectively.

Senator LODGE, who is a student of military and naval problems as a member of the Appropriations Committee, raised numerous questions as to the mission of our Army in national defense and its size, and the urgent need for modern equipment of various types, for more instructors to train aviation pilots, and for revision of procurement plans.

"I think the Navy is much nearer preparedness than the Army," he said. "It is much better off."

"The Navy doesn't have the Army's problem of a lack of weapons. The Navy's problem is whether it has the right weapons. I think that air power's apparent ability to deny to the British Navy the use of Norwegian coastal waters is a development which ought to be thoroughly understood."

"Even if German planes didn't sink a battleship, the fact that they made it impossible for the British Navy to carry out its function raises a fundamental question for us. The relationship of air to sea power ought to be studied most carefully."

"In our Navy the question is whether the relation of air power to sea power is correct."

"In the Army I see the need of a sweeping new policy."

"The Navy is now 85 percent mobilized; the Army 15 percent."

"We're supposed to have a skeleton Army, but many ribs are missing. We haven't made up our minds how much of an Army we need."

"Do we want an Army that we can send to fight in Europe? Certainly not. Do we want an Army that can defend the continental United States and the North Atlantic and the Caribbean area? Emphatically yes."

"Do we want an Army that can do that job if the Navy is in the Pacific and the Panama Canal is in danger? I submit that we do."

"The World War methods of trench warfare and large masses of infantry bear only a remote relationship to the present day of mobile warfare with great numbers of mechanized vehicles. All of our concepts have to be revised."

OUR GUNS OBSOLETE

Senator LODGE pointed out that, as regards antiaircraft defense, we have none of the new 90-millimeter type of antiaircraft guns. Of the old 3-inch type, which we do have, some are now obsolete, he said.

Whether our present antiaircraft defense policy is adequate should be studied, the Senator said. We are not equipped, he added, to prevent establishment of land bases in Greenland, Baffin Island, and Newfoundland.

He stressed the need of far more instructors to train aviation pilots.

"If we tried to increase our training now, with present instructors, we'd run into casualties. We are stretching our instructors as thin as we can now with safety."

There are now 300 instructors, not counting ground crew, mechanics, and other personnel. Six thousand are needed, Senator LODGE contends, with a program for training 25,000 pilots in 2 years. In-

structors should come from the front line, he said, which means replacements for them. Another training station, he added, is necessary beyond the three now operating.

A big difficulty encountered by the British and French, he explained, is the training of pilots.

ARMY SHORTAGES

Turning to deficiencies in the Army, he said that while there now are 223,000 men in the Regular Army and 200,000 in the National Guard there are modern arms to equip only 75,000.

To turn out war material not produced ordinarily by our factories in peacetime, Senator LODGE suggested the building of so-called shadow plants. Such plants in European nations, he explained, remain idle in peacetime, but are maintained and kept in readiness for immediate operation.

"We could use W. P. A. labor to build these plants and maintain them in peacetime," he said.

The military policy, he continued, should be understood not only by the experts and Congress but by the public.

"We can never go back to our old system. We must have frequent concentrations and training for the Army. The Army isn't an army unless it gets together for training. We can't just go on doing squads right at some military post."

The investigation he proposes should start at once, he said, and Congress should remain in continual session, with recesses of not more than 2 or 3 weeks.

INVENTORY NEEDED

It is easy to criticize the Allies for having let Germany outstrip them in armaments. But what of ourselves?

If in the near future a foreign power or coalition were to attack the United States, or another nation in this hemisphere, many soft spots in our defenses would be exposed. Congress has been voting billions for the Army and Navy, but new weaknesses seem to bob up faster than old ones are corrected.

Congress and the public seem willing enough to provide all the defense money that the professionals of the Army and Navy demand. And yet it is apparent that we are ill-prepared.

The Army is far short of the essential equipment for even the modest "initial protective force" of some 400,000 men which it proposes to throw into the field overnight in the event of an invasion.

Of course, the Navy will see to it that nobody lands on American shores, it is argued. And that is probably true. But probably is not enough. The art of naval warfare is moving at a snail's pace compared with the art of aerial war. Even Secretary of the Navy Edison confesses concern about the vulnerability of battleships to bombing attack. The British Navy for the moment stands as an outer line of defense for us, but who can say what will happen to the British Navy in the next few months?

Winston Churchill wrote of Britain's warships: "Open the sea-cocks and let them sink beneath the surface, and in a few minutes—half an hour at the most—the whole outlook of the world would be changed. The British Empire would dissolve like a dream." And so would the smug doctrine of American invulnerability.

It seems to us that the public is entitled to an inventory and accounting of our defense establishment and plans. Not by the admirals and generals; while it is commonly agreed that the men of our high commands are exceptionally competent, they are, after all, the creatures of a caste and a tradition.

Congress should provide for a general reexamination of the whole defense picture, either through a broad-gage joint committee of the House and Senate or through a committee pooling congressional and public intellects.

Such a committee should find out and let the public know the answers to such questions as these:

Is our coast-defense artillery adequate to beat off a hostile navy if our own Navy should be engaged elsewhere?

Are antiquated organization and bureaucratic moss responsible for the faulty warship designs which are revealed from time to time?

Is Army-Navy jealousy damaging the efficiency of our aerial defenses offshore and preventing full cooperation in landing-party maneuvers?

Is our industry making satisfactory progress toward preparedness for the emergency production of military essentials?

Are we in danger of being strangled by shortages of tin, rubber, and other vital imports in case of war?

Are we paying proper attention to the defenses of Alaska, whose outlying islands might be stepping stones for invasion from the Orient?

Is it true that the United States does not have enough antiaircraft guns to protect a single great city? And, if so, what is being done about it?

Whereas in 1917-18 the Allies were able to equip the A. E. F. with artillery and rifles and planes, is it possible that we would be able to equip ourselves in the next war?

Are the Army and Navy getting adequate information from the European war, and are they applying this information to the improvement of our own defense equipment and plans?

Endless other questions suggest themselves.

The people want to make our defenses impregnable. But they will want to know where the money is going and whether they are getting their dollars' worth.

It is time for a full-dress investigation, not a muck-raking expedition, but a fact-finding survey to seek out our weaknesses and expedite their cures.

LET'S TAKE STOCK
(By Raymond Clapper)

This time, perhaps, petty jealousies won't stand in the way of setting up a joint commission for study of our national defense. The urgency of such action now must be apparent to all.

The idea didn't make the grade when it was suggested back in 1938, after Munich.

On December 20, 1938, I wrote: "Hitler could change the world outlook overnight, but there is little expectation here that he will. Convinced of his strength and contemptuous of the democracies, Hitler seems determined, from all information reaching here, to ride out his destiny, win or lose."

On December 21, 1938: "The biggest national-defense need right now is to find out what we need for national defense. * * * One special national-defense committee, combining House and Senate Members, dealing informally with the whole subject, is the primary need."

On December 22, 1938: "Recent world changes have thrust so many considerations into the problem of national defense that Congress would be justified in resorting to special procedure. The most practical method would be to set up a joint House and Senate committee on national defense."

On December 23, 1938: "We are entering a new phase of national defense, forced upon us by changed world conditions. The whole problem of defense must be reexamined. There is only one way to undertake that task—by considering national defense as a unified, interlocking whole."

On December 28, 1938: "A joint congressional committee is the best protection the administration can have against the twin mistakes of inadequate defense and wasteful expenditure."

And on December 30, 1938: "It looks as if we couldn't have that joint House and Senate committee on national defense to make a study of the whole problem. * * * As one of the House leaders explained, chairmen of the regular committees in the House are extremely jealous of their prerogatives."

That was the rock upon which this idea was shattered more than a year ago. Just the one obstacle—committee chairmen extremely jealous of their prerogatives. So nothing was done. The task was left cut up into small pieces among 10 committees.

Now, Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, is reviving the idea, preparing two joint committees, one for naval affairs, another for the Army. Will the fact that a Republican takes the initiative kill the idea again? Or is partisanship to be brushed aside? Are committee chairmen going to continue to be extremely jealous of their prerogatives? Are they going to act like a crowd of Chamberlains? Or are they going to recognize the enormity of the task and join in appropriate methods of executing it efficiently and intelligently?

Action of this kind is far more to the point than vague agitation for "saving civilization." We have a civilization over here. It could be better. But it is so much better than any others the world has to offer just now that we can well devote ourselves to making it secure in this hemisphere.

There is still time to think before the slogans engulf us in hysteria—not too much time, for you can feel the slogans coming on now. We hear the big one already, "The world can't exist half slave and half free." Why can't it? It always has.

Of late tyranny has become more efficient. Democracy must become more efficient. When people begin to say that the world can't exist half slave and half free, it sounds as if the next sentence must read, "We must make the world safe for democracy."

Possibly so. But first of all it might be a good idea to be sure the Western Hemisphere is safe for us.

The way to begin is to take stock, through a joint congressional committee. Then, after taking stock, take action.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it might be argued that a year ago our Army and Navy and air force were adequate, as the world situation then existed, but certainly no person in his right mind who has any comprehension of the defense needs of our own country at this moment will contend that our Army and Navy and air force are adequate, in view of existing situations throughout the world. We do not want the Army and Navy and air force to go to war with any nation outside of our own country, but certainly, in the light of recent developments, we have not sufficient means in the United States at the present time to defend a country of this size. We might have been content a year ago to suppose that we had a defense, but no man who is even moderately well informed as to present conditions will assume that we are in a state of defense at the present time.

What the Senator from Massachusetts says about our not having the men to manufacture battleships, or airplanes, or antitank guns, or machine guns, or the Garand rifle, or any number of other articles which are necessary in carrying on warfare, is to a large extent true; but under existing conditions, the place where that shortage should be remedied is right here in the Congress, because Congress is already well versed in this situation as a result of numerous hearings which have been proceeding concurrently during the present session. I think the Congress should remain in session dur-

ing the summer and put this Nation in a state of defense, for the lessons are well borne out that countries which are unable to defend themselves do not keep out of war, but get into war. All we need is to look at China, Ethiopia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium; and who knows what tomorrow morning's news may be? Certainly the war is very likely to spread. Means of attack which were not used in the last war are already in evidence. We have not the ships we need; we have not the planes; we have not the equipment; we have not enough factories; and we do not have sufficient trained personnel in the factories we have. To some extent we lack critical material. Our Army is too small.

Mr. President, those are simply a few of the conditions which I believe the thoughtful person will concede must be remedied if our country is to maintain its rightful place among the nations of the world.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's argument, but this thought occurs to me: I think everyone is in entire accord with respect to the necessity of the United States having the completest possible national defense, but during the present administration we have spent in excess of \$6,000,000,000 in building up the Army and the Navy, and now we are told that we are pitifully unprepared.

Simply because an emergency has developed abroad, are we going to turn over lump sums to the same outfit of bunglers that apparently wasted the \$6,000,000,000 we spent, without finding out what it is to be spent for, and whether we are to have any better defense after we spend the additional money than we now have?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, while I appreciate that there is a great deal of weight to what my friend and colleague the Senator from Missouri has said, I do not believe we can measure national defense in terms of the money which may have been spent on it. National defense is only as good as are the soldiers and the equipment which are necessary to the occasion. Without the soldiers and the equipment, all the money spent amounts to nothing. Of course, it is pertinent to see that our money is expended wisely.

Mr. President, we do not have enough aviators. Certainly the airplane has demonstrated itself to be a tremendous weapon both of attack and defense. There can be no doubt about that; it is now outside the realm of speculation. While it is pleasing to note that our airplane manufacturing facilities are being expanded rapidly, we do not have the necessary number of trained pilots, and we are not proceeding as rapidly as we could proceed to develop trained pilots.

It has been brought out that we lack certain kinds of guns and that we do not have sufficient trained personnel and equipment for the guns we have. It would be wise, in my judgment, if we were not only to try to get additional guns, so as to equip the force we now have, but also train additional men in the use of such guns.

Mr. President, a man cannot learn to shoot a machine gun as he can a shotgun. A machine gun is much like a piece of artillery. It requires a knowledge of map reading, it requires a knowledge of figuring out firing data, and it requires the ability to shoot at night when the man back of the gun cannot see as well as in the daylight. It requires the knowledge of how to hit a target that cannot be seen from the place where the gun is located, such as the reverse side of a hill, or indirect firing, as it is called. It takes months to train men in that kind of activity. So the situation might be illustrated with respect to every other arm, even with respect to the rifle itself. The proper care and the use of the rifle and the bayonet cannot be learned by simply snapping a finger.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have very high regard for the military experience and judgment of the Senator from Maryland.

He adverts to the fact that we have not a sufficient number of men being trained as air pilots.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why have we not a sufficient number? We have given the Army practically all the money they have asked for aviation. I receive letters every few days from men who want to become flying cadets but who cannot get into the aviation branch.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I will answer the question, which is very pertinent. What the Army asked for 6 months ago, when the air force was being formulated, and what they might ask for in the light of present world conditions are, I think, two entirely different matters.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, a year ago there was no need for extraordinary concern; but I think we are now reaching such a point that it would be well-nigh criminal on the part of the Congress of the United States to permit the defense of our country to remain in the condition in which it is in today, and not put on all speed to place this country in adequate condition to defend itself. The people of the country are relying on us, on the committees in the two Houses, on the administration in Washington, on the advice of the Army and Navy, and they assume that we are in a position to defend ourselves.

The truth is that we have only 75,000 soldiers in the Regular Army who tomorrow morning could be used in the event we were to go to war. General Marshall himself has made that statement several times. The mobile fighting force, not the part that is scattered all over the world in garrisons but the actual Army itself, consists today of about 75,000 equipped fighting men, and that is all.

In the light of what is going on all over the world, if anyone supposes that 75,000 men, in a country of 130,000,000 people, is an adequate defense force, in my judgment, he is reckoning without his host.

Mr. President, we do not have many things which are necessary. We do not have the pilots, and airplane pilots are numerous casualties in war. We ought to have about three or four times the number we may actually need.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield in a moment. It takes a great many trained mechanics to keep a plane in the air. The plane is no good on the ground, and we do not have a sufficient number of trained mechanics on the ground.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with our air situation, I agree with the Senator that we do not now have a sufficient number of trained pilots, and, with our present capacity for training them, there is no probability of training them as fast as we can produce airplanes. A year ago our entire productive capacity in airplanes was 7,000 a year. It has been stepped up, in my judgment, largely because—

Mr. TYDINGS. Because of foreign orders.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because of the repeal of the embargo and the passage of the neutrality act, which permitted the purchase by belligerents of planes made in this country, our capacity to produce airplanes has increased from about 7,000 a year to about 30,000 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not yet.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, the extensions are now in progress.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And they are being paid for by foreign nations, by the way, because of the expansions necessary to fill their orders, in cash.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The planes are being paid for in cash, and these expansions will remain the properties of the airplane companies when the war is over, or when these orders cease.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So we have in progress now an increase in our capacity that will take airplane production to around 30,000 a year. But we are not training pilots sufficiently fast to man that many planes. In the Navy we have,

of course, a training school for the naval aviator. We have at Randolph Field, San Antonio, Tex., a sort of bottleneck through which the Army training is concentrated. Kelly Field is also there. Brooks Field is close by. But, when the necessary capacity is reached—and 30,000 a year may not be sufficient, it may ultimately be necessary to step production up to 50,000 a year—what we need if the emergency arises, and when we get these planes, is men who know how to fly them and man them.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I am contending.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that Congress is willing to provide the necessary funds to train men to fly these planes if an emergency of any kind should require it for the defense of our country and of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I am not rising particularly to criticize anybody or any branch of the Government at all for the situation we are in at present. Naturally those having the program in charge did not want to spend any more money for military and naval preparation than they felt should be spent, and I can in great degree sympathize with the administration in perhaps not wishing to go any further into that field than it has gone. I am not finding fault, because it would not do any good, in the first place; and, secondly, I have been particeps criminis, as a Member of the Congress, in whatever the situation may be today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment I will yield. But what I want to point out now is that the time for acting like the ostrich has passed. We can no longer dwell under the illusion of safety. We cannot judge what may happen in the future on a mere speculative basis. We have confronting us the grim realities of a European and Asiatic war which is constantly spreading. In addition to that we have the knowledge that at present, whatever we may have assumed 6 months or a year ago, our state of preparedness, our state of defense, is woefully inadequate.

My few remarks today, insofar as they have weight, are directed not so much at the Senate or the House or the administration. They are directed partly to myself; they are directed to the country. We must from now on work hard to put this country in a state of adequate defense, and we need to do it so as to avoid a tremendous and unnecessary loss of human life. Should the awful specter of war ever come again to this country, which I trust it will not, I hope we shall not send to their death men who are poorly trained and poorly equipped, and in another war perhaps risk defeat simply because in our great desire for peace, in our hope that war would not come, in our hope that war would not spread, and in our desire to be a Christian and an upright people, we tarried too long when reality all around us told us it was unwise to tarry further. I am sounding this note today, and I intend to sound it at least once a week until some action is taken to increase our Army.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I agree with him that the day may come when we shall find that we are not training men for aviation with sufficient rapidity. If we were to be plunged into war tomorrow morning, we should find ways to do it. We should go to work on the problem. I do not want to wait until war comes to have that sort of stimulus. I want to prepare men, not for war, but if war comes to us, so that the country will suffer as little loss of human life as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not assume that the Senator was criticizing anybody. It does not lie in the mouth of any of us to criticize anybody else, because national defense is a joint responsibility. We know that every nation which has been overrun or is now being overrun, and every nation which may be overrun in the near future, is in that condition either because it could not or would not see the situation which confronted it. If the foresight of such nations had

been as good as their hindsight now is, they might have been better prepared.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Far away as we are from the conflict, we know that the world has become a small place.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is only a short distance across the oceans. Far away as we think we are and feel we are, and much as we want to remain away from the conflict, it would be stupid on our part to sit idly by and do what other nations have done—wait until the time arrives when the facilities are needed.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only way to guarantee our Nation and our hemisphere against that very thing is to do what the Senator is now advocating.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is exactly correct. Let me rivet my observations with two very pertinent comments:

First, if we prepare now, while we have time, the cost will be about one-half as much in actual money as it will be if we are compelled to prepare without adequate time.

Second, if we prepare now in an orderly way, the job will be better done, and it will be done through the processes of democracy. If we do not prepare now, the plight of this country will be such that we shall have to give up practically all power, and to some extent we shall have to imitate the very forms of government which most persons are now contending are improper.

So, from the standpoint of economy, from the standpoint of political philosophy, and from the standpoint of human safety, it is a good investment for us now to go into this matter thoroughly and do everything we can to bring the state of defense up to a position commensurate with that of our country's problems.

If anyone had said 6 months ago that Norway and Denmark were to be invaded, he would probably have been laughed out of any company as either a warmonger or a man whose judgment was not to be trusted. Many persons did not believe that either Holland or Belgium would be invaded. During the neutrality fight I wrote to my constituents a 14-page letter giving the reasons why I voted for the so-called neutrality bill. I frankly stated that from what I could understand Holland and Belgium would be invaded. It was only a guess on my part, of course. I was no prophet. No one would then agree with me that such a thing was within the realm of possibility.

Today no man knows what the outcome of the war will be. No one can tell whether England and France, on the one hand, will win, or whether Germany, on the other hand, will win. The war may engulf all Europe; it may engulf all Africa; it may engulf all Asia before it is finished. Certainly, I hope it will not. I hope my observations are wild speculation. However, we must begin to think in terms of realities. Wishful thinking is not enough. I have no doubt that the majority of the people in Denmark, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, and Ethiopia, as well as in China, wished, hoped, and prayed that war would not come to them. However, that did not stop it.

The only country which can stay out of war today is the one which has the will to stay out and the force to make attack against it too costly. In the field of reality there is no way for us to meet world conditions short of those two things—first, the desire of our people to stay out; second, the knowledge on the part of any aggressor that it would be too costly and unwise to attack us.

Let me refer to some possibilities. I am not prophesying. I am not saying that these things will happen. However, suppose that a certain nation—I do not wish to mention names—should be the victor in this war. Where would Greenland and Canada go at the peace conference? Who knows? Who will own Canada after the war is over? Will England continue to own it if she loses the war? Who will own Greenland? The thousand miles from Norway to Greenland, with the intervening islands, represent no obstacle. We talk about building a naval base in the Aleutian Islands in

Alaska. Just as good a base could be built in Greenland. Where would we then stand?

We cannot do all these things in 5 minutes. We do know what confronts civilization. We do not know what new pages of history are to be written. We do not know whether or not our own destiny is as secure as we think it is. As my friend and colleague from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said, the oceans are not as wide as they formerly were. There are new weapons, new ingenuity, new daring, new ways of doing things. Invaders no longer come over the sea exclusively. Who would have thought a little group of soldiers could drop by parachute from the air into a city of 800,000 inhabitants, such as Rotterdam, more or less exposed to the view of all the people in that city, and seize an air field, which they hold at this minute?

Where should we put our 75,000 American troops? Should we put them in New York? Should we put them all in Baltimore? Should we have some in Boston, some in Chicago, some in Atlanta, some in Norfolk, and some in Newport News? If we should do so they probably would give a good account of themselves; but in time of war they would certainly not be adequate to protect the people of this country against the possibilities which confront us.

Mr. President, I do not wish to sound a note of great alarm or fear. I do not think we are going to war tomorrow morning. I do not think we shall have to sit up until midnight tonight to start on this problem. However, I do think we ought to commence on it in this Congress, and do the job thoroughly. If we have not a sufficient number of pilots, we should find ways and means to get them. If we have not enough antiaircraft guns, machine guns, Garand rifles, or what not, let us find ways and means of commencing to get them. If we have not a sufficient trained personnel—which we have not—to build airplanes on the scale of 30,000 a year, which Germany is already able to do, let us start to get them. If we have not enough Garand rifles, let us start to get them.

In the light of present conditions, with this country in the situation in which it is so far as national defense is concerned, for the present Congress to adjourn without action on this problem would be a crime against the democracies of the Western Hemisphere and the people of this country. I should like to go home as much as anybody would. I am not trying to be an alarmist; but I hope, in the light of the facts which have appeared on the front pages of newspapers in the past week, that at long last the lethargy, the indifference, and the isolation attitude—the attitude that nothing can happen to us—has ended.

I think the statements of the leaders of our Army and our Navy should begin to register in the consciousness of the American people. Not to prepare is to pay a terrific and unnecessary price in human life and human treasure—money, if you please. Not to prepare is to jeopardize the greatest democracy left today on the face of the earth. No man can tell what the turning of tomorrow's page in history will mean. He may assume; he may wish; but the fact today is that throughout the world the only nation which is safe from attack is the nation which is prepared to resist attack. If it is not prepared to resist attack, in my judgment it is in serious danger. The United States is not at all prepared to meet the problems which have arisen as a result of the happenings of the past 2 or 3 weeks.

Fortunately our Navy, our first line of defense, is perhaps up to a finer state of efficiency and preparedness than is either of its supporting arms, the air force or the Army. Fortunately, during the past 4 or 5 years we have not neglected our Navy. The Navy is our first line of defense. Even so, the air force is a new thing, and I feel that we should immediately address ourselves to this problem, and put the country in a position to meet any possible attack which may perhaps come to us as a result of some future happening.

I desire to reemphasize that it will cost one-half as much if we start at it now as it will cost in a period of great emergency; and I also wish to reemphasize if we do not do it now that a man who could do it in a short space of time will

sweep away all the things we call the institutions of democracy, for it will take little short of a dictatorship to put into action the forces which will have to be put into action if our country should become involved in this war.

I do not want us to become involved in it; I am not advocating that any of this be done for any other reason than the defense of our country. I do not believe that at this time we could serve any good purpose by becoming involved in Europe's war. First of all, we have not anything to fight with except our Navy; we could not take our Army out of the country; there is not enough of it; and, therefore, I hope that my remarks will not be misinterpreted as a warlike speech against any government; but I hope they will be interpreted only as a speech to apprise the people, in some little measure, that we must commence to put this country in a state of defense, and not again permit men to be drafted in time of war and 5 or 6 weeks later be given a rifle, as they were in the last war, and told to "go over the top" in the face of a trained and highly equipped enemy. That would be nothing short of democratic murder, and if we are going to walk that pathway again, I tremble for the stability and future of this Government.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. IV

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. From the Select Committee on Government Organization, I report back adversely Senate Concurrent Resolution 43, disapproving the Reorganization Plan No. IV.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the subject.

The question from now on which I think will be propounded by the Presiding Officer will be on which side of the question does a Senator stand.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 43, which is a highly privileged matter, and I ask that the resolution be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43), which had been reported adversely, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. IV transmitted to Congress by the President on April 11, 1940.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the law which establishes the rule by which the concurrent resolution is to be considered, there is allowed a maximum of 10 hours debate. However, I have conferred with the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, and it has been agreed that we can get along with less time than that. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed not later than 3 o'clock p. m. tomorrow to vote on the final disposition of the pending concurrent resolution.

Mr. McNARY. I shall object at this time, as I desire to give the matter a little further consideration. I will confer about it later, but at this time I object.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRNES. Under the law the motion of the Senator from Nevada is a privileged motion, and it is in order for anyone to move to limit the debate, and such motion is not debatable. I ask the Senator from Kentucky whether he cares to make such a motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think, as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Oregon who says he wants to confer about it, I would not make that motion now.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say that I would prefer an agreement to vote on the matter, and I think we can agree.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say a word as to my understanding of the rule, and I should like to have the attention of the leader and also the attention of the Senator from South Carolina. I should like to be set right as to the matter of parliamentary procedure. If I yield to any Senator or if any other Senator yields to another Senator during the pendency of this question, will not the Chair inquire as to whether or not the Senator to whom the holder of the floor yields is for or against the pending question? I should like to have the rule made clear.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield to me, it seems obvious that the spirit of the rule was to limit debate to the pending question, because the time is divided equally between the two sides. The mere fact that a Senator said he was for or against the resolution, and then went on and made a speech on some other subject, would not, in my judgment, be in conformance with the spirit of the rule. I do not know how the Chair would rule on the question whether or not the debate must be limited to the question, but it seems to me that, inasmuch as the time is divided, it would be within the spirit of the rule to have the debate limited to the question; otherwise, some Senator might get the floor and talk indefinitely on another subject, and thus deprive the side on which he happened to be of any opportunity to discuss the pending question. That is a matter which the Chair probably will have to rule on when the question arises.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the question of whether or not debate is on the resolution is, in my opinion, one of not very great importance. In any event, there is nothing in the rule or in the order under which we are working that limits the debate to the pending resolution. A Senator could speak, in my opinion, on any subject as long as he wanted to. That is the interpretation I have placed on the order. I shall be very glad to have the Chair rule on that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The law provides that the time shall be divided. The Chair is not advised as to what Senators will control the time. The Senators controlling the time should know on what subject a Senator to whom they yield a part of the time will speak. That is a matter that will have to be controlled by those who control the debate. The Chair is not in a position to determine the subject Senators may discuss. The Chair should like to be informed as to how the debate is to be controlled.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, I think it might be well to settle that question, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that in the distribution of the time the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] shall control the time on his side and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the chairman of the committee, shall control it in opposition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. If that is agreeable to the able Senator from Nevada, I have no objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is agreeable to me.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will suggest that this morning we have heard two speeches on the deficiencies of our national defense. Those speeches, if believed, are calculated to scare the people of the country and to cause them to believe that we have nothing in the way of either an Army or Navy or an Air Corps. Some time in the next—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, right there may I say that, holding the floor as I do, I think that during the course of this debate I, for one, will discuss that subject to some extent; but I do not want this uppermost and privileged subject to be interspersed with matters that will take up the time. I say that with the greatest desire to be courteous to every Senator. We have a question to be disposed of; we have a limited time for debate. The law limits it. So can we not proceed under agreement to address ourselves to the all-important subject, which is a privileged question?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a suggestion in the form of a question. My own time is limited.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish merely to say that there are one or two Senators who feel there should have been some reply to what was said this morning, but the Senator from Nevada has precluded that opportunity by taking the floor and imposing this limitation. I repeat there were certain things which should have been said in order that the country might know the inaccuracy of the statements which were made on the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon; I did not make and did not impose a limit, the law itself imposes the limit.

Mr. ADAMS. I referred to the Senator taking the floor and making the motion before reply could be made.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was essential that the matter be brought up, because it was the pending question.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Chair that I will not agree to the control of the time that has been suggested.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry. Mr. President, may I have a parliamentary clarification of the situation? Do I understand that by unanimous consent it was agreed that the Senate would vote at a given hour tomorrow?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That request was not agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the debate, which is by law limited to 10 hours, be limited to 8 hours.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it. Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is that question subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not subject to debate under the statute. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada that the debate be limited to 8 hours.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that the committee having to do with reorganization has filed an adverse report as to Senate Concurrent Resolution 43.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to file a report?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am wondering about the parliamentary situation. I do not want to lose the floor, and I do not want to take up time. I should like to be courteous to every Senator; but we have here an entirely new question as to which the procedure seems to be fixed by a new statute, and I am trying to conform to the statute.

Mr. WALSH. I have no desire to interfere with the Senator's remarks; merely to submit a committee report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry, and I hope the Senator will pardon me.

The opening addresses of this morning—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that under the present parliamentary arrangement the Senator from Nevada may now occupy the entire 8 hours if he so desires?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not the situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the law provides that the time must be equally divided. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Nevada, being on one side of the question, will have not to exceed 4 hours.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think that in a very short time the leader or the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and I will agree as to a division of time. I am entirely willing to agree now.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, under the motion the Senator has made, the law provides that one-half of the time shall be consumed by those in favor of the resolution, and the other half of the time shall be consumed by those opposed to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BYRNES. So it is not necessary to have an agreement. The Senator has one-half of the time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, again reverting to the subject very ably discussed today by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] it has been demonstrated beyond peradventure of a doubt that there is now no military agency in the control of man more effective for defense or offense than the agency of the air. I say without fear of contradiction that it has been established in Europe up to this hour that an independent control of air facilities in any nation is the paramount thing. Only 48 hours ago it was reported over the radio that there was such a division of power in Great Britain that when the air forces under control of political agencies in Great Britain sought to attack in Norway, instead of acting in cooperation with the naval forces they were compelled to telephone or telegraph to London for authority.

An independent agency, free from political entanglements, has been the greatest agency that any nation has ever owned; and, looking to that point of view, looking to that thought, and with that in mind, the Congress of the United States was far ahead of any other country in the world when in 1938 it passed the bill establishing the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Immediately you say to me, "What has civil aeronautics to do with military aeronautics?" Today civil aeronautics is the greatest adjunct of military aeronautics. Why? Because with one command, with one word today issued by the Civil Aeronautics Authority every single airship in America and every air line will immediately become an enlisted agency to transport men and facilities for air defense from one coast to another in a country which extends 3,500 miles from coast to coast.

How much better will we be if we stand by the studies that we made over 5 years, which studies finally produced the Civil Aeronautics Authority, rather than to throw this adjunct into the confusion of a new set-up in a new authority in a new condition, whence it emerged in disaster in 1938?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator undoubtedly is familiar with the fact that the President of the United States himself has corroborated the statement just made by the Senator from Nevada as to the importance of civil aviation in connection with national defense when he said, in his letter to the National Aviation Forum of January 24, 1939:

Civil aviation is clearly recognized as the backlog of national defense in the Civil Aeronautics Act, which set up the effective machinery for a comprehensive national policy with respect to the air.

Precisely bearing out the statement just made by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator. I have had in mind this fact, because it was not without consultation with the President that the Civil Aeronautics Act was written. It was not without consultation with the President—this very President, if you please, whom the Senator from Missouri and I supported on two occasions to become the President of the United States—that the Civil Aeronautics Act was written. Not once but four different times were we called into consultation, so that the act might be the very thing which he, in the statement read by the Senator from Missouri, declared it to be, namely, the backlog of national defense.

Are we going to burn that log now? Are we going to destroy it now? Are we going to set it into the chaos of a new surrounding? We know what it has done. Shall we destroy that? Shall we say to the world, "Yes; we know what our civil aviation has done; nevertheless, we are going to try a new experiment with it?"—and, indeed, an experiment it would be; an experiment with a history so emphatic that we should not even for a moment consider it, because that experiment is one that has cost the lives of hundreds of passengers and hundreds of pilots.

Go back to the old regime? Go back to the age and the hour of human destruction? Go back to the thing that caused Congress to create the investigating committee which cost thousands of dollars? Go back to the condition that made aviation in America a thing that many would not invest their money in; that many would not travel on; that no agency seemed to be able to control?

After our coordinate House on the other side of this building has voted, by an overwhelming vote, not to go along with the Executive order, I am not ready to believe that the Senate of the United States, with all of its history, with its origination of the present civil aeronautics plan, with its observation of success through the years, is now going to vote that success out of existence; and I hope no man or set of men will have the temerity to say, "If you do not do this you are not supporting the administration." Such an absurd statement is beyond the pale of human decency, because it was this administration which gave rise to the present law. It was the President of the United States who gave rise to the most efficient law on the subject of aviation that has been put on the statute books up to this hour; and now to say that we are not going along with the President when we refuse to recede from our position is a mere absurdity.

Mr. President, who is advocating the destruction of the law which Congress passed? Who is calling upon Congress to destroy its own handiwork? Are the people doing it? Is there, in this country today, any group of people who seek to destroy this law, and to put the Civil Aeronautics Authority into a new agency? Will some Senator within the sound of my voice name that group of people? Where are they? What do they stand for? Who are they? Can their names be put upon the record of the Congress? I doubt it. Is any agency seeking this new—if I may so term it—legislation? Let us see. If we are going down to dollars and cents, who has the greatest amount invested in the great art and science of civil aviation? Let me say to you that during the present year the air lines have borrowed \$25,000,000 to go forward with air-line activities under the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Let me say to you that they may borrow \$25,000,000 more to go forward with their work.

Are they seeking to destroy the law which has been in effect since 1938? In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be found resolutions passed by every air line in the United States, perhaps with one small exception, some little line which I have not in mind. Every major air line in the United States has passed a resolution against Reorganization Plan No. IV and in favor of the concurrent resolution now pending, known as Concurrent Resolution No. 43. So there is the industry, with all of its invested capital, with all the money it has borrowed, with all of the lenders of that money, if they count for anything, asking the Senate of the United States to stand by its guns to the end, that the law enacted by the Congress shall remain the law in this all-important hour, when these people are investing every cent of their capital and when they are borrowing more so as to invest more. So that group wants the law to remain as it is.

Then let us turn to those who carry more on their shoulders than any group which is at all interested in this subject. Let us consider the men who must die first when a crash occurs, the men who seldom survive to tell the tale when an airplane goes down. Today they are walking the streets of Washington, they are in the Halls of Congress, they are wearing their uniforms of honor, in righteous indignation at the idea that that which would preserve their lives, that that which has preserved their lives for over a year, shall even for a moment be marked as a subject for destruction.

They have been typified as the "lobby to save human lives." Rather sarcastically was that expression used, I am sorry to say. But they are not the only lobby which seems to be working here; and if they be a lobby to save human lives, then God is with them, man is with them, the people are with them, and the industry is with them.

Why destroy this agency now? Because the press of a country wants it destroyed? I have here at my hand what constitutes a volume of clippings, and I have them alphabetically arranged by States. I shall not attempt to put all of

these into the RECORD, but I do intend to read the captions of some of them. They are not mere comments; they are editorials from the papers in the respective States of this country.

Alabama has made her contribution. The Birmingham Post, under date of April 18, contained an editorial under the headline, "No Retreat on Aviation." This is a splendid editorial on the subject.

Again, in Sheffield, Ala., the Tri Cities Daily, of date April 19, had the headline, "Hill-Sparkman Bill is Sound." It deals with the very subject we have before us.

Again, there is the Gadsden (Ala.) Times of April 16, containing a splendid editorial. The Gadsden (Ala.) Times on April 11 again contained an editorial under the title, "President Asks New Program of Reorganization."

Again, the Huntsville (Ala.) Times contains comment under the caption of the Washington Merry-Go-Round.

Again, the Montgomery (Ala.) Journal of April 16 contains an editorial under the caption "Civil Aeronautics."

All of these are speaking from the State of Alabama.

Then we come to the State of Arkansas, and under the caption, "Aviation Menaced by the New Order," we have a most outstanding editorial, together with a number of others which I will not take the time to put into the RECORD.

We then come to California, and under the caption "Aviation and Politics" the Los Angeles Times contains a denunciatory editorial against the proposed change in the law.

The San Jose Mercury Herald of April 17 publishes an editorial headed "Order Criticized," dealing with aviation and the proposed change.

The San Diego Union, under date of April 13, contained an editorial under the headline "A Reorganization Blunder."

Then we come to Colorado. Under date of April 18, 1940, the Rocky Mountain News says, "No Retreat on Aviation."

The Chieftain, of Pueblo, Colo., has an editorial under the headline "Renewed Attempt by President to Get Reorganization Powers Meets Opposition." It deals with the subject most intelligibly.

We then come to Connecticut, and the Bulletin, published in Norwich, Conn., on April 18 contained an editorial under the headline "A Blow at Success," dealing with the subject of civil aeronautics and denouncing the proposed change.

Then the Hartford (Conn.) Courant contained an editorial under the heading "Altering the C. A. A.," denunciatory of any attempt to destroy the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram contained an editorial under the headline "Safety and Reorganization," again drawing the attention of Congress to the idea that the law it enacted should not be destroyed by an agency.

The Hartford (Conn.) Courant of April 23 published an editorial headed "For Safety in the Air," praising and commending the present law, denouncing the effort to set it aside.

The Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., under the headline "Why Not Leave it Alone," dated April 17, contains a most comprehensive editorial.

Now we come to Florida, a State much interested in aviation, and I find an editorial under the headline "C. C. A." of date April 13, from the News of Miami.

Again, the News of Miami, Fla., of April 14 contains an editorial headlined "Suggestion," dealing with the subject of aviation, and denouncing the C. A. A. being transferred to another agency.

Again, the Miami News of April 23 contained an editorial under the caption "Dangerous Missetp," denouncing the idea of destroying the Civil Aeronautics Authority by putting it into a political agency.

Then we come to the State of Georgia. The Telegraph and News of Macon, Ga., of date April 21, 1940, published an editorial under the caption "Pilots Plead for Safety," dealing with the subject of the pilots of the United States being here in Congress asking that the present Civil Aeronautics Authority should continue to exist as it is.

Again, the Telegram of Macon, Ga., under date of April 26, 1940, contains an editorial under the caption "Protesting a New Peril." In other words, this paper sees the return of

the Civil Aeronautics to a political agency as being a peril, and denounces the proposed transfer.

In the State of Idaho we find an editorial from the Twin Falls Times dealing with the same subject and in the same way.

Then we come to the State of Iowa. Its press has been filled with editorials denouncing the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, an independent agency, to a political agency.

In the State of Kansas, the State so ably represented here, we find in the Kansas City Traveler of April 22, 1940, an able editorial under the caption "Keep the C. C. A. As It Is."

Then we come to the State of Kentucky, the State so ably represented by the leader of the majority in this body. We find the Sun Democrat issuing an editorial under the caption, "Economy in Government Not Easily Gained," dealing with the Civil Aeronautics Authority commendatorily, and denouncing the proposed change.

I have any number of articles coming from several papers in Kentucky, and if I should put them all into the RECORD I would be censured for utilizing all the space of the RECORD. These comments come from the State represented by the able leader of the majority on this side.

Then we go to Louisiana. The New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, under date of April 22, asks "Shall the C. A. A. Continue?" lauding the record of the C. A. A., denouncing the proposed transfer.

The New Orleans (La.) Item, under date of April 23, under the caption "Air-Traffic Control," issued a splendid editorial commending the present Authority, denouncing the proposed transfer.

Then we come to the State of Maryland. Mr. President, the matters I have been referring to are all editorials. They are not merely news comments. They are thoughts expressed by those who have in charge the editorial guidance of the press.

The Evening Sun of Baltimore, of date April 13, carries an editorial under the caption "Messing It Up." It calls attention to the awful mess that will result if the Civil Aeronautics Authority is put into a political agency. It deals with the record which has been made by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and denounces its proposed destruction.

Then we come to Massachusetts. The Evening Union of Springfield, under date of April 16, carries an editorial under the caption "Reorganization," in which it commends the law passed by Congress creating the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and praises its record of performance, and its ability to perform and denounces its destruction.

The Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., in an editorial of April 17 under the caption "C. A. A. Should be Preserved," extols and commends the work of the C. A. A. and denounces its transfer.

Then we come to Worcester, Mass. The Worcester Gazette of April 18 carries an editorial under the caption "C. A. A. is Being Kicked Around," in which it denounces the policy that would do that very thing.

Then we have the Mercury of New Bedford, Mass., of date April 19, which carries an editorial under the caption "Opposes Reorganization."

The Transcript of North Adams, Mass., under date of April 26 carries an editorial under the caption "Not so Shrewd," which again denounces the policy of change.

The Boston Herald, under date of April 20, carries an editorial under the caption "Monkeying With C. A. A."

All these editorials, Mr. President, and more, we draw to the attention of the Senate.

Again we have an editorial printed in the Free Press of Detroit. The State of Michigan, through its editorial writers and in various newspapers has been heard in denunciation of the proposed change. The Free Press says, "Change Would Be a Calamity." The editorial denounces the transfer of the C. A. A., and demands that it remain an independent agency.

Again we have the Saginaw News of April 22, which prints an editorial under the caption "No Place for Politics." The editorial in that splendid newspaper denounces the

idea of the execution of this law being placed in a political agency.

Then we have the Detroit Times of date April 23, which prints an editorial under the caption "Keep Aviation Law," dwelling on the subject of what has been accomplished under the aviation law as it is now written, and what might be the result if it is destroyed.

Then we have the News of Saginaw, Mich., under date of April 22, carrying an editorial under the caption "No Place for Politics." It deals with the subject in a manner similar to that of other editorials.

We have an editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald, of date April 25, under the caption "Aviation Resents It." It is a long editorial, comprising almost a full column in length, which denounces the proposed change.

Then we come to the State of Minnesota. The Winona (Minn.) Republican-Herald of April 24, 1940, carries an editorial under the caption "Flying and Reorganization." It supports the principle I am advocating here, namely, that the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which has accomplished so much, shall not be destroyed.

Again we have an editorial from the Tribune, of Minneapolis, of date April 24, under the caption "Safety in the Air," dealing with the subject quite at length. It denounces the change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority as it is now constituted, to any agency of the Government.

We come now to the State of Missouri. The Kansas City Star, of date April 15, carries an editorial under the caption "Spinach or Snap Judgment?" It deals with the expression which was made, I am sorry to say, some weeks ago, in which this subject was dealt with so lightly as to be called "spinach." The editorial deals with the subject in a strong, forceful way, denouncing the idea of a transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to a political agency of the Government.

Then we have an editorial in the Star-Times of St. Louis, of date April 22, 1940, under the caption "A Blunder in Reorganization." This is an editorial which strikes squarely and decisively at the idea of the transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, from being an independent agency, to one controlled by politics.

We have an editorial printed in the Kansas City Times, of date April 22, under the caption "Think Again, Mr. President." The editorial denounces the idea of the transfer of this agency to the Department of Commerce or any other department.

Then we have an editorial printed in the St. Louis Post Dispatch, of April 22, under the caption "But Is it Spinach?" dealing with the subject quite at length, and denouncing the change.

Then we come to the State of Minnesota, and we have an editorial published in the Helena (Mont.) Independent, of date April 17. The editorial is ably written by the editor of that newspaper under the caption "Not All Spinach." The editorial again deals with the subject of the transfer, and denounces the idea of transferring the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present independent position.

Under date of April 19, an editorial is published in the Helena (Mont.) Independent, under the caption "Severity For Safety." The editorial deals with the subject of safety at length. It commends the Civil Aeronautics Authority for its splendid record made up to date. It hopes that nothing will transpire which will take the Civil Aeronautics Authority out of its present independent control.

Then we have an editorial from the Journal, of Lincoln, Nebr., under date of April 23. It is an able editorial under the caption, "Reorganization Protest." The editor of that great newspaper denounces the idea of a change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present position to one of obscurity.

Mr. President, if I were to put into the RECORD, or even name the articles that appear in the press of these respective States, I would be criticized for taking up too much space in the RECORD. I am now dealing with editorial comments, nothing more.

We come to the State of New Jersey. The Bergen Record, of Hackensack, carries an editorial under the caption,

"Changes." In that editorial it denounces the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The press of the State of New Jersey carries a number of articles on the subject. Every one we have had an opportunity to see denounces the proposed change, and calls it revolutionary and destructive.

Then we come to the State of New Mexico. The Albuquerque Tribune of date April 19, carries an editorial under the caption, "No Retreat on Aviation." It draws the attention of the people to what may be a decisive retreat if we destroy this agency which has accomplished so much.

I draw the attention of the Senate to the press of New Mexico, and I might draw the attention of the Senate to the press of every State of the Union if I saw fit, and thereby express to the Senate what is the view of the press of this country.

We now come to the State of New York. The New York Times of April 13, under the caption, "Shifting the C. A. A.," denounces the idea of destroying this independent agency.

The Palladium-Times, of Oswego, N. Y., in an editorial dated April 13, under the caption, "Business and Weather," draws attention to what has been accomplished by the C. A. A., and denounces the proposed change.

Next we have the Star-Gazette, of Elmira, N. Y., under date of April 16, under the caption, "Vigilance Necessary," lauding the work of the C. A. A., and denouncing the proposed change.

A copy of the New York Times editorial under the caption, "Shifting the C. A. A.," is published approvingly by the Glens Falls Times under date of April 15.

The Union-Star, of Schenectady, N. Y., under date of April 17, published an editorial entitled, "Too Much Delegation of Power," denouncing the proposed change.

The morning Wall Street Journal of April 18 contains an editorial entitled "An Indefensible Merger," denouncing the change proposed by the President's Reorganization Plan No. IV.

The Schenectady Union-Star of April 19, under the caption "Yesterday's Best Editorial, Why Repeat a Mistake?" denounces the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present admirable position and condition to that of a political agency.

The Times-Record of Troy, N. Y., under date of April 22, in an editorial under the caption "No Political Domination," denounces the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to a political agency.

The New York Journal-American of April 22 contains an editorial under the caption "A Blow at the Aviation Industry."

Let me say, Mr. President, that no greater blow was ever struck at an industry than is being struck by the President's Reorganization Plan No. IV; and no greater effort was ever made to save an industry and a great independent facility than we are trying to make by Senate Concurrent Resolution 43.

Under the heading "A Blow at the Aviation Industry," the New York Journal-American denounces in no uncertain terms the idea of changing the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present position to that of a political agency.

The Telegram, of Malone, N. Y., under date of April 22, deals with the subject under the heading "Domestic Issues Vital."

The Star-Gazette, of Elmira, N. Y., under date of April 22, discusses the matter under the heading "Domestic Issues Vital." Each of these editorials deals with the subject very much at length.

The New York Herald Tribune of April 26, under the caption "Keep the C. A. A. Independent," deals with the subject more drastically, perhaps, than any other.

The Union-Star, of Schenectady, N. Y., under date of April 17, deals with the subject under the caption "Too Much Delegation of Power."

The Buffalo Evening News of April 22 contains an editorial under the caption "Politics in Aviation."

In all these editorials, and more, the press of the great Empire State of New York denounces Reorganization Plan No.

IV and extols the effort being made to save the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. President, if I were to go further with the voice of the press of America, I could only add to what I was trying to say at the outset. The people of America have denounced the proposed change from the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce. I challenged any Senator to state the name of a group of persons in America who wanted the proposed change, and there was not a single response. I repeat the challenge, because I have been unable to find any such group.

I also asked if there was a single industry in America which desired the change. I referred to the fact that the industry now striving to go forward with civil aviation has borrowed \$50,000,000 or more in order to go forward with this great industry. The aviation industry does not want the change. Its representatives are asking that the change shall not come about.

Mr. President, on my desk I have editorial comments from every State. I shall refer to some of them later. Each one of them denounces any change in the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. President, an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 30 has just come to my attention. The editorial is entitled "Advance of Aviation Industry Depends Upon Congress' Action Now." That editorial, coming from a great newspaper of the West, recites the history of the effort which was made to make civil aviation an independent agency which would accomplish something, and then recites the fact of the accomplishment. The editorial then sounds the warning, in no uncertain terms, that if civil aviation is again thrown into chaos and confusion we do not know where such action will lead.

Mr. President, two speeches were made in the Senate today which support my position. So far as I am concerned, they were unexpected. One was by the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], whose view on the subject seems to me to be indeed sound. The other was by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. Other Senators contributed observations; but those two speeches in particular lay a groundwork for my position today in resisting the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority into a political agency. The arguments of the two Senators to whom I refer are so much more cogent than anything I could say that I draw their remarks to my support.

Mr. President, if there ever was a time when this country should cease political activity and look to its defense, to avoid letting the blood of the youth of America, this is the hour and this is the time. This is no time to quibble over what Mr. Smith, of the Bureau of the Budget, may think or conjecture. It is time to deal with facts which have been established by an unblemished record.

Let us go forward with safety while we have it. Let us go forward with an American agency builded by an American Congress over a period of years, when America was seeking to lead the world in civil aeronautics, so that Columbia might boast of ruling the air as Britannia boasts of ruling the waves. We are in that position now. Shall we resign from that place? Shall we tear down the structure which Congress has built? Shall we say that we shall relinquish our thought, our ideas, and our study to someone who deals in conjecture?

Mr. President, if the Civil Aeronautics Authority has worked effectively up to date, why will it not work effectively from now on, at least until the clouds of trouble shall have passed away, at least until the dissipating and destructive thought of war shall have gone from us? No agency of national defense is more powerful than aeronautics. There is no way of training a pilot in the air more effectively than to train him to carry human beings from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. President, scathing ridicule has been hurled at a group of young men who have come to Washington. They have been called a lobby to save lives. I hope some Senators have met them. They are fine men. They are the men who sit at the controls of the ships of the air, which carry our

friends and families across the land and over the water. They are here pleading that the law shall remain as it is. Every man of them is a trained warrior, subject to his country's call at a moment's notice in time of war. Every one of them knows the terrain of America. Every one of them knows the air currents. Every one of them knows the rules. They are soldiers in civilian uniforms, ready to go. They have been trained by an industry. Their training has been made possible by a law. They occupy their present positions by reason of the training which was given to them at the expense of private industry, costing the Government not a single cent.

Let the civil aviation industry go forward in America. For God's sake, do not destroy it now, when it is seeking to uphold our national existence by offering to pay the tax which we may call upon it to pay to protect us in an hour of need. Do not destroy or discourage this industry, which is willing to borrow and borrow and borrow to the end that it may build and build and build for national defense, without a single dollar coming out of the National Treasury to support it, except for carrying the mails. Little by little, the rates for carrying the mails are being reduced.

Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that I had hoped we might have a little more definite understanding as to a division of time. I know there was an opportunity, and I hope the Senator will not consider me as being at all critical, but would the Senator care to enter into an arrangement that the proponents of the resolution may have the opening and closing? That seems to me to be not an unreasonable suggestion.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there was objection to any agreement as to control of the time. I did not have anything to do with the proposal. The Senator from Kentucky made it, but there is now no way by which anyone can control the time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lee	Sheppard
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Ashurst	Frazier	Lucas	Slattery
Austin	George	Lundeen	Smithers
Bailey	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire at this time to continue for a short time with the subject I have in mind, in order that the discussion may be completed, and not broken into.

I have just had handed to me an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, of Milwaukee, Wis., of date April 23, under the caption "Keep air authority independent." I did not have that editorial mounted in my volume which I shall always retain as a memento of a great event, so that I have to read it separate from the bound volume which I have here at my desk.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

LXXXVI—375

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the Senator familiar with the one instance in which a publisher of a newspaper very closely affiliated with a certain Government agency wrote a flaming editorial against the President's reorganization plan, and just a couple of days later turned up in Washington trying to influence his Congressman to vote in favor of the reorganization plan?

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, yes; I have heard of that incident. It was an isolated incident, but it was forceful nevertheless, and gave evidence of certain conditions which prevail at this hour.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When it comes down to the question of lobbying, does not the Senator think that the suggestions and the urgings of men who every day take in their hands their lives and the lives of their passengers ought to be given more weight than the wishes of the R. F. C.?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should think so; but, then, in the changing hour and the drastic force that is being put forward to defeat this resolution, I never know what may happen.

From the State of Virginia I have, from the Petersburg Progress Index, an editorial of date April 18 under the caption "A Reorganization Faux Pas," denunciatory of the move to change the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present independent position to a political position.

I have in my hand an editorial coming from the Virginian Pilot, of Norfolk, Va., of date April 15, under the caption "Why Change Aviation Control?" dealing with the same subject in very much of a similar way.

I have in my hand a recent series of editorials from the State of Texas; one from the Brownsville Herald of date April 20, entitled "Don't Shoot the Watchdog"—a startling headline, very much apropos to the subject—which deals with the disastrous effects prior to the establishment of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the results of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and what may follow if that independent agency is destroyed.

I have in my hand an editorial from the San Antonio (Tex.) Express of date April 17, under the caption "Keep the Civil Aeronautics Authority independent," dealing with the subject very much at length; and I hope the Senators, as they listen to me, may look at the length of these editorials. The editorials I have mentioned today are not mere casual, off-hand expressions. They are editorials which evince thought and study, resolution and determination on the part of the editors who speak for the people in their respective communities. They are editorials representative of the editorial thought of America, and each one of them that I have referred to here today denounces the change.

I have in my hand an editorial from the Texarkana Gazette of April 13, under the caption "Penalizing Efficiency," which deals with the subject of the destruction of an efficient independent agency and its placing in a political agency of the Government.

I have an editorial from the San Antonio (Tex.) Express, under the caption "Let the C. A. A. and the Air Safety Board Alone," another emphatic expression; and again I draw the attention of the Senate to the length of these articles coming from the pens of editors who have important matters to think about and deal with. They are not merely flimsy expressions which pass away with the moment. They are expressions which signify thought and resolution.

Again, I have in my hand an editorial from the El Paso Herald-Post, under the caption "Air Authority Shift," dealing with the subject somewhat at length.

Then, Mr. President, we come again to the great State of Tennessee. I have in my hand an editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar, of date April 23, under the caption "No Retreat on Aviation." I hope the good Senators from Tennessee may listen to me and consider that editorial. It deals with the subject thoughtfully, resolutely, and emphatically.

Again, I have in my hand an editorial from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., of date April 23, entitled "Stick

to the C. A. A.," a very emphatic expression dealing with the subject from a comprehensive point of view.

Again, I have in my hand an editorial from the Nashville Banner, of date April 20, 1940, entitled "Pilots Protest Justly." I do not know whether or not the attention of that group of fine boys who came to Washington to protest for the welfare of their lives and the lives of the passengers who ride under their control, was brought to an editorial of that kind, but there is an editorial which supports their position, because they do protest justly; and who has more right to protest? Who knows air conditions and the industry of aviation better than the pilot who flies above the clouds and has anywhere from 10 to 40 human lives under his control? Who knows the strain of that responsibility better than does that pilot, who knows that not only his own life but the lives of his fellow beings and the lives of his industry are in his hands? When they come here wearing their uniform of honor—although it has been sarcastically dealt with—when they come here pleading with the Senate of the United States not to change this law, they have behind them something more than mere personal, whimsical desire. They have behind them something more than a desire for personal power, because not one of them knows what political power is. All they know is the power to do, at a moment of emergency, what their training has given them a knowledge of doing. They are not dealing with politics. They are dealing with industry; they are dealing with human lives; they are dealing with a progressive movement in America which spells more than all the political agencies in the world. Yes; "Pilots Protest Justly," an apt editorial from the Nashville Banner.

Then I have here, from the Journal of Knoxville, Tenn., an editorial, of date April 23, under the caption "We'd Say Leave it Alone"; in other words, another expression demanding that the Congress of the United States, which has before it a record of achievement, leave alone the agency which brought about that achievement, and take no chances on the conjecture of a Director of the Bureau of the Budget who knows as much about aviation as a Hindu knows about skates.

Then we have from South Dakota an editorial from the Rapid City Journal dated April 23 entitled "Turning the Clock Back." Observe the length of this editorial, and reflect on the thought of the editor that was put into it. It is not a mere expression, not a passing fancy with him. He was seeking to do for his country and for his State and his cause something which would be worth while. He was trying to give to his country an expression, through the columns of his paper, which might reach the eyes and ears and attention of those who are interested in one of America's great industries and great achievements. He was trying to write a message to the world, to America, and to the Congress, which would sink deep into the hearts of his readers. Under the caption "Turning Back the Clock," he dealt with the history of aviation, and dwelt on the things which would be accomplished by leaving well enough alone.

Then there is from the Lead (S. Dak.) Call, of April 23, 1940, under the caption, "C. A. A. Hit" a very pointed, sharp editorial which deals with the subject, and denounces the proposed change.

Then from the State of Rhode Island I have in my hand an editorial from the Newport News, of April 23, 1940, under the caption "Air Safety." Again I draw the attention of the Senate to the thought that is put into these editorials, to the development of the thought, and to the time it took for these editors to put out these independent expressions. Let no one say that there is anyone on the side of the question from which I speak now who has the power to go into the respective States and bring from the editorial columns expressions of confidence or expressions of denunciation such as I have read to the Senate today. We strive because we believe our cause is just, and in that justice we are thrice armed, and if there come to our aid and our comfort such expressions from the editorial pens of the press of America, so much the more are we resolved to go forward, because we know that thinking men of America, men who are independent, without regard to political affiliations, are speaking on and of and about this

subject, not mere expressions, but editorials reaching the length of whole columns and double columns, dealing with a subject which is uppermost in the mind of every American who thinks of war today, and, thinking of war, wants our aviation facilities to be out of political control. He wants aviation to be and to go forward under an independent agency, so that when the time comes if this Nation—and God forbid—should be called upon to defend itself, it can call upon an Army of trained boys who guided human life, the most precious cargo in the world, across the continent, over the waters, over the mountains, above the clouds, and landed them safely without a single loss of life in a year, with 86,000,000 plane-miles flown and 814,000,000 passenger-miles flown in that year. That test alone should commend this agency to the Senate of the United States above any lobbying which can be brought to bear, above any steam roller which can be brought to bear, above any command for personal courtesies to be extended to anyone.

Mr. President, in this matter there are no personal courtesies to be extended. This is country, this is God, this is liberty, this is freedom, this is democracy, not politics, or personal courtesies. Nor is it a question of whether your State or mine will get some particular advantage. That is not the question. It is not a personal matter, and I hope it never will be.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have been unable to find any editorials or writings attacking the Safety Board. These editorials are unanimous, or very nearly so, are they not?

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as I know, they are unanimous. Perhaps I have not been able to get the editorial expression of every paper in the United States, but I have tried to get the opinions of as many as I could, and I find a unanimity running through them all. I will deal with the Safety Board in a few moments.

Mr. LUNDEEN. As one Member of the Senate, I appreciate the magnificent and able fight the distinguished Senator from Nevada is making, and I have found the corps of pilots who have come to Washington, that group, the men of aviation, unanimously behind the Senator in the position he has taken. They are enthused, I wish to say, for the Senator's encouragement, over his stand, and the warrior spirit he always shows in any just cause which he chooses to espouse.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota. I am grateful. I feel that I am battling in a just cause, for my country. I am not battling for a single advantage for myself. There is not one employee of the Civil Aeronautics Authority who holds his position on my recommendation. So that I battle for nothing that is personal. But I think that personalities and personal advantage should be laid aside at this hour, and that our country should come first.

Mr. President, I have in my hand from the great State of Pennsylvania, an editorial from the Philadelphia Record, under date of April 21, under the caption, "Why trifle with the Air Safety Bureau," again denouncing the proposed change.

Again, from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, I have an editorial dated April 17 entitled "Air Safety Not 'Spinach' to Flying Public." That is a striking caption, "Air Safety Not 'Spinach' to Flying Public." The subject may be "spinach" to some people, but to those who go into a plane to travel from one end of the country to the other, and desire to come off the plane alive, air transport is not "spinach," notwithstanding the fact that it may have been so typified.

I have in my hand an editorial from the Allentown (Pa.) Call, dated April 20, under the caption "Keep Air Control Out of Politics." Again I draw the attention of the Senate to the length of the editorial, as of every one I have used.

I have from the Pittsburgh Press an editorial, dated April 18 under the caption "No Retreat on Aviation." I may

say in this respect that for us to adopt Reorganization Plan No. IV, for us to vote down Concurrent Resolution 43, would be a decisive retreat. It took the Senate 5 long years; it took the writing of 21 bills; it took the presentation of some 10 or 12 bills; before a conference committee, after months of study, finally adopted the present law, which is today as clear as the noonday sun. Those who say it is an involved law, or hard to administer, or confused, simply do not know what the law is; they have not read it; they have not seen it; and they do not understand it. It has not been confusing to an Authority which accomplished results in 12 months. There has not been any confusion there. Human life has been saved, and there is never confusion where that is accomplished. So, when this editor says, "No retreat on aviation," I adopt that as a slogan, because there should be no retreat from what is right and just.

I hold in my hand an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, of April 18, under the caption "Supervision of Aviation Should Not Be Transferred to Commerce Department."

Mr. President, again I draw the attention of the Senate to the length of the editorial. It is not an editorial which came out of a passing thought; it was studiously written, and ably and forcefully put forth.

I have in my hand an editorial from the Dispatch-Herald, of Erie, Pa., dated April 20, under the caption "Keep Politics Out," again denouncing the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present independent position to a place in another department, and especially the Department of Commerce in which it has no place.

From the State of Oklahoma I have in my hand an editorial from the Shawnee Evening Star, dated April 16, under the caption "Save the C. A. A." It is an appeal from an editor; it is an appeal from an independent American; it is an appeal from a man whose pen would lead the Congress of the United States to listen to the voice of humanity in this great struggle; it is an appeal to save something which the Senate created; it is an appeal that in the hour of need we not destroy something that has accomplished so much. So he says, "Save the C. A. A."

Then I have in my hand an editorial from the Shawnee (Okla.) News, of date April 17, under the caption "Save the C. A. A."

Mr. President, this is the voice of the press, the voice of the people, to which I have referred. No Senator has told me here on the floor today, although I have called for the statement twice, that any people or group of people requested this change. No one has asked for this change in all the length and breadth of the country. I have not been able to find a single editorial expression favoring the change. Neither have I found one single member of the industry in America, comprising that great line of airships which supplies transportation facilities for the country, asking for the change.

Mr. President, who asks for this change? Who wants to destroy the accomplishment of the Civil Aeronautics Authority? Certainly it could not have been the President, because the President extolled the Civil Aeronautics Authority, not once, but three different times. He referred to its marvelous work, under which he said 500,000,000 miles have been flown without a fatality. He might today say 814,000,000 miles have been flown without a fatality. So it is not the President who is calling for this disastrous change.

Those who are saying "Uphold the hands of the President" are looking to the wrong source, because the President has said that the Civil Aeronautics Authority is the backbone of American defense. He did not say that it should be in the Department of Commerce then, and he was speaking in the not-far-distant past.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Evidently the President has changed his mind very materially in the last 11 months, which comprises a portion of the period during which there

have been no accidents on air lines in the United States, because just about 11 months ago I made a speech—not in the Senate, but outside the Senate—in which I adverted to the number of employees of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and that the Authority complained because it had taken over too many of the employees in the Commerce Department. The President wrote me a letter and took me to task, not questioning the accuracy of my figures, but taking me to task for quoting those figures as to the personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in view of the great work the Authority had been doing.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am glad to have that expression. It is in keeping with history.

Mr. President, let me be a little frank here. The law was not written in a minute. Five years' work was put into the writing of this law. I will speak only from the record of this very body. When the junior Senator from Nevada first presented a bill to make the Civil Aeronautics Authority an independent agency, and to take the whole affair out of the Post Office Department, and out of the Commerce Department, and out of the I. C. C., Senators will recall that the President sent down a message in which he said he wanted all transportation facilities under one body, namely, the I. C. C. And so, with that in mind, Congress voted down my bill.

Then a conference with the President led me to write the bill again, providing that it all be placed in the I. C. C., and to make it conform to the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the President by his message desired. Then, Senators will recall that the bill was killed here in the Senate because the Post Office Department was ardently opposed to it. The Post Office Department did not want the agency transferred out of the Post Office Department into the Interstate Commerce Commission, and so the measure died again.

And then—there is no secret about this, it is common knowledge—I had the privilege of being called to the White House, and the statement was made to me, "I think you were right in one instance. Now go back and write your bill over again." He then gave me some suggestions, every one of which was carried in the bill that is now the law. There are Senators here who know the truth of my statement. So I rewrote the bill to conform to the views of the President, and brought it back into the Senate. And that able Representative from California wrote a companion bill, and we came together in the conference committee and worked out a workable, feasible, uniform, and unified law, which has worked so well that even the President, the Members of Congress, the members of the Department, and the world at large, if you please, have commented on it, have commended the law.

Now who wants to destroy it? It was Omar who said:

Ne'er a peevish boy

Would break the bowl from which he drank in joy.

The bill was created with the thought and collaboration of the President. This is the President's bill. I am willing to resign any credit that might come to the author of the measure. It came out with his approval and approbation, and after he had studied it. It has worked well.

Mr. President, not the people, not the press, not the industry, not the pilots, not any agency that we know of or that anyone has designated has demanded this agency's destruction.

Yet you are told here that as a matter of courtesy to someone you should support him. You are told that if it is not carried out the way they want it, it will be too bad for you. You are being told many things, I am sorry to say. But, after all, the question of justice and fair play is before us, and a law that is worth while is being defended to the best of our humble ability.

Mr. President, I can only conclude these remarks of today with one wish and one expression that comes from the heart, and that is that those who worked with me to produce this accomplishment will not now work to destroy their own handiwork.

Mr. MALONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahay	Lee	Sheppard
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Ashurst	Frazier	Lucas	Slattery
Austin	George	Lundeen	Smathers
Bailey	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the action of President Roosevelt in submitting his fourth plan on Government reorganization, and particularly the part of the plan which would transfer the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce, is a demonstration of unusual courage. I suppose in all the country, and taking all things into account, there is no man better informed on the science of government than the present President of the United States. He knew, I am sure, that his proposal to transfer the Civil Aeronautics Authority would provoke criticism and some excitement—even to a greater extent, at this particular time, than any other reorganization plan he might submit. Because he is a student of government, and has a better understanding of politics than most men, he knew that the suggestion of a change, at a time when we were rejoicing over a period of completely successful commercial aviation, would excite disapproval in some places. That is why his action was courageous.

The mere fact that there have been no fatalities in commercial aviation over a long period of time is, in my opinion, no sufficient reason why the proposed change should not be put into effect. There may be—and I am ready to believe that there is—a great need for the change; and the reasons advanced by President Roosevelt and supported by other distinguished and expert authorities convince me that the plan is sound and should be made effective.

There is no personal or political profit to the President in the proposal. As I view the matter, the only profit afforded to him, or to his administration, is the consolation and satisfaction of advancing the cause of good government through the contraction of bureaucracy and the concentration of effort and work in a more compact group. It seems to me that the plan he submits removes some of the existing confusion, offers a greater opportunity for cooperation, and effects some economy.

It seems to me that the courage and foresight of the President afford the Government and country an opportunity partially to break down the growing threat of a dictatorship of bureaucracy. More than that, and especially in this particular instance, it gives the Civil Aeronautics Authority, or the Civil Aeronautics Board, a voice at the Cabinet table, and brings this extremely important department of the Government, and likewise an important part of our national economy—the air industry—a little closer to the man whom the people of the country so overwhelmingly selected to guide and guard their business affairs.

There is, at the moment, a feeling that these vehicles of the air may become important defense weapons in our plans for national safety, and the closer we bring the activities of aviation to the head of our Government the better, I think, will we be served.

I very well remember the discussions—some of them bitter—excited by the proposals for a reorganization of the executive branch of government. I was greatly concerned about the matter, and was not completely in accord with the administration. I very well remember that some Members of Congress did not believe that much reorganization was possible, and, if I remember correctly, some of them entertained the opinion that there would be no reorganization of government under President Roosevelt. It is not hard to understand why they felt that way. Without very much trouble, I could find any number of people who could give some satisfying reasons why any and every agency of our Government should be excepted in any reorganization plan.

Reorganization Plan No. IV has excited widespread attention and provoked criticism and resistance in the instance where it affects the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board. I cannot easily understand the occasion for all the excitement, because I fail to find where any of the functions of this tremendously important Authority or the Board would be curtailed. I think the excitement has been artificially stimulated. Members of the Air Safety Board were appointed by the President; and I completely set aside as unworthy of serious consideration the contention that other men charged with carrying out the same functions will be less faithful to their trust, or to a greater degree subject to the pressure of politics or any outside influence. I choose to believe that men charged with the almost-sacred responsibility of protecting the courageous pilots who daily travel the airways, and their passengers, will be honest and faithful to the duty assigned to them.

In my opinion, it is unfair to take advantage of a successful record of commercial aviation to oppose a change intended to provide greater safety. I prefer to believe that the record of safety and success in the late months and years has been largely due to the inventive genius exercised in the manufacture of airplanes, and in the better training and broadened experience of pilots and others engaged in the aviation industry. While the record in commercial aviation has lately been perfect, the experience of the flyers in the Army, engaged in more hazardous flying, has likewise been good. No later than a day or two ago I discussed this particular matter with flying Army officers.

Mr. President, there is one very unfortunate circumstance surrounding the debate on this subject. There will be accidents; it is inevitable that there will now and then be a serious accident, and it is within the realm of possibility that it will come today or tomorrow. Within a period of a few weeks we read of a railroad tragedy costing the lives of many people, and that accident followed a long-time period of safe operation on the road on which the catastrophe happened. If the President's plan should be adopted, and an accident should occur, it would be especially unfortunate for him, and for those of us now supporting his views, because this discussion will focus attention upon any such accident and will magnify everything about it.

The idea of a reorganization affecting the Civil Aeronautics Authority is not very new. During the discussion of the reorganization bill in 1939 several Senators anticipated such a change if the reorganization bill should be passed. Last evening I took occasion to refer to that debate, and I quote one brief statement made by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], as follows:

Because of the President's interest in this particular agency it is my personal opinion that he has not in his mind now any idea of disturbing it; but I hope that when he investigates it, when he makes a survey, when he finds what the Appropriations Committee has found, he will give consideration to it, because of my firm conviction that something must be done about it, and that the President must do something to bring about greater accord in the administration of the act in which the Senator from Nevada has been so greatly interested.

I should like now to remind Senators, Mr. President, that that statement, made by the junior Senator from South Carolina, was made under different circumstances and conditions than now exist. It was made at a time when the junior Senator from South Carolina himself said that he doubted that the President had in mind any change in this instance. Let me emphasize the fact that the junior Senator from South Carolina then also said, a year or more ago, without any thought of this proposed change, that he felt, as a result of his experience as an active member of the Appropriations Committee, that such a change was sorely needed. It seems to me that particular situation becomes important now as we consider something which then was not anticipated.

At that time the distinguished and very able and patriotic Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who has contributed so much to aviation in America and so much in many other fields, proposed that the Civil Aeronautics Authority be excluded from the reorganization bill. His amendment was rejected—and rejected in spite of the fact that all Members of the Senate have an extremely high regard and warm admiration for the junior Senator from Nevada, as well as an understanding of his knowledge of aviation and of his contributions to its advancement.

Mr. President, in the discussion of any controversial issue there is certain to be misconception and misunderstanding. Sometimes a bit of it is purposely inspired, but more frequently, and to a greater degree, the misunderstanding arises from a lack of knowledge of the facts involved. I confess that I do not approach a discussion of this subject as an expert on aviation but rather as a student of government, as one anxious to reduce rather than build up bureaucracy, and as one convinced that this particular reorganization proposal would deliver the many problems of aviation into good hands.

The present Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Edward J. Noble, who has been for some time acting as Secretary of Commerce, is himself a graduate student of aviation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Connecticut said about the distinguished Under Secretary of Commerce, and I agree with all the encomiums which he has passed upon him. Does the Senator from Connecticut know whether or not the Under Secretary of Commerce is in favor of this change? It seems to me to be very significant that the very able and astute chairman of the Select Committee on Government Organization, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], was careful in summoning the witnesses to appear before his committee in the 2 days' hearing not to include the name of the Secretary of Commerce himself or of the Under Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MALONEY. I seriously doubt that I have a right to speak for the Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Noble, but I think that I may very safely say that he is not only in favor of the change but is anxious to see it brought about.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator give some intimation to the Senate as to the basis upon which he makes his last statement?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; I will be pleased to do so. Excited by the militant and aggressive and able effort and argument of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I spent some time going into this subject. Mr. Noble is not only a constituent of mine but a friend; and because of his particular knowledge of the subject and his long-time active interest in it, his participation in aviation as a flyer, and because of the position which he holds and the fact that he was formerly Chairman of the Authority, I naturally turned to him for his opinion, as well as to numerous others.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator says he referred the matter to Mr. Noble?

Mr. MALONEY. I discussed the matter with him.

Mr. McCARRAN. And on that basis the Senator states to the Senate that Mr. Noble favors this proposed change?

Mr. MALONEY. On my own responsibility. I have not asked his permission to say that, and I endeavored to reply fairly to the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator does say now that Mr. Noble, the Under Secretary of Commerce, favors this change from the present conditions?

Mr. MALONEY. I say it on my own responsibility. I assume the responsibility of saying that, in my judgment, Mr. Noble favors the change.

Mr. McCARRAN. So long as the Senator puts the matter in that way, it is all right.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Noble formerly served as chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and is a flyer, and one of America's outstanding businessmen. The subject of aviation is close to his heart; and what I say of him I could almost say about the present Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, Mr. Hinckley.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say, so far as Mr. Hinckley is concerned, that nobody has greater respect for the work he has accomplished than I have. As a matter of fact, I entertain a very deep personal affection for him; but if Mr. Hinckley is in favor of this transfer, as he indicated before the Byrnes committee the other day, I can say of my own knowledge that he was not in favor of it the day before he visited the White House.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the able Senator, following his example of a few moments ago about Mr. Noble, that not only was Mr. Hinckley not in favor of the transfer, but in his expressions in my office in the Senate Office Building he was very much and openly opposed to this entire change. I say that, using the same tactics that the able Senator uses with reference to Mr. Noble.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think the Senator quite means that I am using any kind of tactics in reference to Mr. Noble.

Mr. McCARRAN. Except that when I asked the able Senator whether it was Mr. Noble's view that the change should be brought about, I remember the Senator said he answered on his own responsibility.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am answering on my responsibility.

Mr. MALONEY. I am quite certain that what the Senator from Nevada says is true, but I can also quite understand how even an authority on the subject might change his mind. I am not qualified to speak for Mr. Hinckley. I scarcely know him. I am only familiar with his record in the field of aviation, and I have not at any time discussed with him his views on this subject.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, just one more interruption, please. Will the Senator bear with me again?

Mr. MALONEY. I will; yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the able Senator that one of the most cogent expressions Mr. Hinckley made before the Committee on Reorganization on last Saturday was that the Safety Board had furnished a pattern of safety in aviation that would be followed for many years to come.

Mr. MALONEY. I may say to the Senator that that may be true without any detriment to this particular proposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the same connection, Mr. Hinckley followed that statement with the further statement that the Civil Aeronautics Board, to which all the functions of the Air Safety Board are to be transferred, not only could but would carry out the pattern and improve it wherever necessary, and

as the development of the aviation industry made it necessary and justified it.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, the Senator from Kentucky knows that the life of the Civil Aeronautics Authority has been parallel with that of the Air Safety Board, and while there has been an effort on the part of the proponents of the so-called McCarran amendment to demonstrate that the splendid record of safety which has been attained is entirely due to the Air Safety Board, we cannot entirely forget the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Authority, existing at the same time and with the actual authority to put into effect safety measures, in my judgment to a much greater extent than the Air Safety Board, has been responsible for the splendid record commercial aviation has enjoyed. In saying that, I do not for a moment want to detract from the remarkable record and fine experience of the Air Safety Board.

Mr. President, when interrupted—and I was pleased to have the interruption—I was referring to Mr. Hinckley. I should like now to take up the subject there, and say that a discussion of his interest in aviation and of his contributions to aviation might fill a book; but because there is a limitation of time in this debate, and because so many Senators are anxious to discuss the matter, I am compelled to limit my remarks.

The pressure of other congressional duties—and every Senator knows that they are very pressing—has kept me from knowing all the details of the matter under discussion; but I am impressed with the fact, or what seems to me to be a fact, that misinformation on the subject has been widespread. I have talked with some of the fine young men who came to Washington as representatives of the commercial Pilots of America, and I have talked with members of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and with Army officers, and with Members of Congress opposed to the plan, and I am finally convinced that we should support the President's proposal.

It is unfortunate that the proposed change has played upon men's emotions. The ghost of fear has been injected into the discussion over a period of weeks—and when I say that I do not intend anyone to understand that I think it has been done other than with honest intention—but catch phrases dealing with life and death take hold of the public very easily, and attempts to dissipate catch phrases and the fevers excited by them are not easily set aside by fact or reason. Recognizing that, it is important that we calmly review the importance of the question involved, and that we endeavor to understand the motives and the objectives and the merits found in the proposed reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. We must understand them if we are to be completely fair to the hundreds of thousands of persons who fly in airplanes, whether they be on the regular commercial air lines of our country, or on nonscheduled flights. In full fairness to the vitally concerned and affected American public who share our interest in the continuing successful development of civil aviation, we must be calm and fair. For the sake of the pilots who cross our country by air, we must endeavor to make clear the motives and the objectives and the merits of the change proposed. We also owe that to the aviation industry, which, as we measure time, is a new, although extremely important, part of our national economy. To just as great an extent we must make this matter clear if we are to be fair to the Government, which, after all, is charged with the responsibility of encouraging and protecting the industry in such a manner as will best affect the public welfare.

It has seemed to me sadly ironic that some of the distinguished men who have made protest in this controversy—although doing so with noble intention and the sincere desire to promote the continuing progress of civil aeronautics—may, at least to a slight degree, hinder the advancement of aviation and this great air industry. I am, at this point, referring to the charge made that if Reorganization Plans Nos. III and IV are adopted, the splendid record of safety which has been established through painstaking years of trial and error will be destroyed. I do not want to make the charge that that statement is ridiculous, but I do insist that no single person or group of persons monopolizes a

desire to make flying safe, any more than any one person or group of persons monopolizes the determination to keep our country out of war.

I do not mean to imply that exciting this fear is a charge that the President, or the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, or those of us supporting the reorganization proposal, are indifferent to the safety of those who fly. It is true, however, that some persons out over the country may finally entertain such a thought, so, in effect, the patriotism of certain public officials is actually questioned. I think that view may be at least partially destroyed by reminding my listeners and other persons interested in this subject that among those who are supporting the plan are long-time intense enthusiasts of aviation. I seem to remember that President Roosevelt made a historic flight to Chicago in uncertain weather, and I am mindful of the fact that members of his family are constant patrons of the airways, and that Mr. Noble and Mr. Hinckley have long been devoted to the advancement of aviation. Thus, to imply that President Roosevelt would carelessly impede the progress of aviation is unfortunate. His administration has contributed much to the successes which aviation has enjoyed in recent years. I point out that no one who has taken the time and trouble to study the existing set-up of the Civil Aeronautics Authority can fail to recognize that administrative changes are necessary if the Authority is to continue to function effectively.

May I briefly examine the proposal in part?

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 created three autonomous groups in one agency, namely, the five members of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Administrator, and the Air Safety Board. Although Congress intended to make a sharp definition in authority and function between the three groups, that intent was not carried into actuality by the law which we finally passed. It is no longer a secret to those who have to any extent investigated the matter that there has been friction in the agency. This friction unnecessarily complicated the difficult work confronting the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and it seems to me, Mr. President, that Reorganization Plans Nos. III and IV promise an erasure of the confusion created by the failure of the law carefully to define and firmly to fix responsibility and authority.

I said earlier, and I now repeat, that this reorganization proposal was not created by hurried judgment. The conduct and operation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority had been painstakingly reviewed and examined by the Bureau of the Budget. I am told that that Bureau spent 5 months on the task, and, in addition to that, that President Roosevelt had the benefit of the experience of the officials of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. I say again that one of the men best qualified to speak on the merits of the proposed change is the distinguished Chairman of the Authority, Mr. Robert Hinckley. He has probably lived as close to the subject as has any man in America, and, in commenting upon the President's proposal, he said:

I think the changed set-up is a great step forward, and I do not get excited about all this talk about aviation having received a step backward.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator quoting from the hearings?

Mr. MALONEY. I am quoting from a statement made by Mr. Hinckley prior to the hearings.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not from the official hearings?

Mr. MALONEY. From a statement made prior to the hearings.

Mr. McCARRAN. So many statements have been made by Mr. Hinckley that I was wondering which one the Senator was quoting.

Mr. MALONEY. I read the one I was quoting.

Mr. McCARRAN. I knew the Senator could not be quoting from the hearings, because I have a report of the hearings before me. But let me say that Mr. Hinckley has denounced this proposed change very vehemently, not only to me but to

others. So my quotation may be just as effective as is the Senator's.

Mr. MALONEY. I have attempted to dispute nothing which the Senator attributes to any other man. I am certain the Senator is accurate when he does so.

The judgment and the expressed opinion of Mr. Hinckley has great weight with me, because it is founded on experience and a devotion to aviation. He has lived with the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the problems of civil aviation, as Chairman of the Authority, for the past year. For a long time before that, actually for many years, he was vitally interested in aviation and was one of the first patrons of commercial flying. He has closely watched aviation grow up.

In addition to redefining authority the reorganization proposal does away with the Air Safety Board. That, more than anything else, provoked the existing disturbance; and so, at this point, I should like to say again, by way of emphasis, that the reorganization suggested does not abolish the functions of the Air Safety Board—the particular function of which is to investigate accidents. The actual and only effect of the proposal, as I see it, is to abolish or abandon three titled positions. The investigation of accidents will continue as heretofore and, in my judgment, will continue with efficiency and with complete indifference to politics and pressure.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator will tell me if it annoys or disturbs him to be interrupted.

Mr. MALONEY. Not at all; I am pleased to be interrupted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the very condition to which he refers—namely, the condition in connection with investigating as to safety and as to accidents—was a function of the old Bureau of Air Commerce, and in every instance it resulted in whitewashing, because the rules and regulations were promulgated by that very agency, and the safety devices were under the control of that very agency. Of course, the agency was not going to lay the blame upon itself or upon one of its members. It is proposed that we put the five-man board right back again where the old safety board was, under the former regime.

One further interruption, and then I shall not disturb the Senator again.

Mr. MALONEY. Please let me say to the Senator that I have no objection to his interruptions. I appreciate that he is an authority on this subject, and I am glad to have his opinion.

Mr. McCARRAN. I want the Senator to set himself right in this matter. Before we set up the Civil Aeronautics Authority aviation had not only one member in the Cabinet, it had two members in the Cabinet. It had the Postmaster General and the Secretary of Commerce. I want the Senator to keep that thought in mind. Now it is proposed that this activity be put back under the Department of Commerce, in which all the present chaos arose.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the Senator's interruption at this particular time, because I think I understand the views of the junior Senator from Nevada. I think I appreciate as much as does any other Member of the Senate his devotion to aviation, and I have referred to that in my brief remarks. But, in my opinion, his comparison is, unintentionally, hardly fair, and I shall attempt, in the few moments more I shall take, so to prove.

Mr. President, I have not gone very deeply into the matter, but I know enough about the situation to know that friction has for some time existed within the Air Safety Board. I am advised, and am rather astounded to learn, that on no occasion, while the three members of the Board were in office, did they submit a unanimous report on an investigation of any accident. That seems quite serious to me, and, incidentally, seems quite unnecessary.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss briefly the final broad phase of the reorganization plan—the matter of a transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce. A feeling exists in some places, and in the minds of

some men, that under the Department of Commerce the Civil Aeronautics Authority officials would lose their identity. We have the word of the Attorney General that the officials charged with the guiding and guarding of aviation would be completely independent, and I think that most Members of this body are now satisfied that they would be independent. If that is true, I fail to understand the reasons for the excitement. If it is untrue, I should like to have someone undertake to tell us how or where the independence would be lost or destroyed.

Members of the Senate have read the statements of President Roosevelt, and the exchange of correspondence between the Bureau of the Budget, and Mr. Hinckley. These statements and this exchange of correspondence satisfy me that the independence of the aviation authority is properly protected and established under this reorganization proposal. To me it seems careless to insist that the fine safety record of commercial aviation will be endangered or destroyed by a transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce. No one would take away from the Civil Aeronautics Authority, or the Air Safety Board, any of the credit which they so richly deserve, but I cannot give them all of the credit for the fine air record of commercial aviation during the past year.

I cannot forget that when control of our commercial flying was under the direction of the old Bureau of Air Commerce, in the Department of Commerce, aviation, as compared with this day, was just out of its infancy. I cannot forget that the control which the Bureau of Air Commerce then exercised was a limited control. There were many more fatalities in aviation then than now, as has always been the case with the creation of new methods of transportation. It would not have been fair, or at least reasonable, to expect that the early days of transportation by air would be free from the tragedy of accident. Accidents and fatalities were the terrific price we paid for the splendid aviation facilities of today.

I should like to remind my fellow Senators that the old Bureau of Air Commerce was without authority to impose very complete regulation upon the air lines. It was without authority to stop practices born of competition between air lines, when such competition might have in some instances resulted in the neglect of the fundamental principles of safety. The Bureau of Air Commerce of that period was without authority to issue certificates of convenience and necessity by which it could effectively act on the side of safety. The planes of that period were without ever so many of the items of safety equipment that are now available—adequately trained pilots were not so numerous as they are today and airports were fewer in number and less sufficient in quality and facilities than they are now. The use of radio to guide pilots had not then been developed to the effective standard of this year, and the inventive genius of airplane designers and those who labored in the research laboratories of the country had not yet discovered or invented much of the protective airplane equipment we now have. Weather reporting and aeronautical charting were not so extensive or so valuable as they are now. Briefly, during those years when the Bureau of Air Commerce was endeavoring to assist an infant industry in its development we were actually in the middle ages, or the dark era, of aviation.

Under all these circumstances, Mr. President, it is not entirely fair to place the blame for the numerous accidents which then occurred entirely upon the men who served upon or in the Bureau of Air Commerce. I presume that there were mistakes then, and probably more mistakes—yes; many more mistakes—than in these later days, but I desire to point out that those officials were under a more serious handicap than we are now likely quickly to realize. It was out of the experiences of those days and out of the experiences of the officials who directed that Bureau that the framework for the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was drawn. It is out of the experience of the 1938 act that President Roosevelt has now submitted a reorganization plan which is intended to advance our present splendid position in aviation. It seems to me that there are good reasons for the change, and it further seems to me, Mr. President, that we may be applying the

brakes on the progress of civil aviation if we refuse to heed the suggestion and advice of those more closely associated with the subject than we are.

May I say, again, that through a transfer of the Civil Aeronautics to the Department of Commerce, we will go forward, and by this proposed change we will more firmly establish the Federal program for Civil Aeronautics in the household of the Federal Government. The vital reporting services of the Weather Bureau, the experimental testing activities of the Bureau of Standards, and the air navigating charting work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, are in the Department of Commerce and thus close at hand. It seems to me that there is economy and a chance for a greater efficiency in the proposal. It seems to me that the plan will do away with a duplication of activities and will save money.

I have about concluded, but I wish to say again—and I think this is of extreme importance—that this change will give this very important agency of the Federal Government a place at the Cabinet board. I repeat, in a world greatly disturbed by war, we cannot overlook the fact that the change may be advantageously important to our national defense. I am very hopeful that the President's position will be sustained, and his plan approved. I repeat, he has acted with his customary courage, and those who have long sought a reorganization in Government should be mindful of this further service he renders his country.

Mr. TRUMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahay	Lee	Sheppard
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Ashurst	Frazier	Lucas	Slattery
Austin	George	Lundeen	Smathers
Bailey	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridget	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 43.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is that if there be no further debate, automatically the House Concurrent Resolution 60 comes to a vote.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Do I understand that the Senator from South Carolina is not going to use his time?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there is no agreement by which we have time.

Mr. McCARRAN. There was an agreement to vote at the end of the debate of 8 hours. I tried to get an agreement for a definite hour at which to vote, and now I shall ask again that the vote on this matter take place at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I ask the leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], to propound the request for unanimous consent on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to voting at 4 o'clock tomorrow, provided we proceed long enough this afternoon to consume some more time. I would not want

to make any request of that sort now based upon the idea that we quit now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for the purpose of enabling me to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think we may safely assume that there are a number of other speeches to be made on both sides of this question. Inasmuch as under the statute drafted by the Senator from South Carolina himself the time is to be equally divided, it seems to me that fair play would indicate that the time be used with something like equality, so that neither side would be compelled to carry forward the burden of the debate with the purpose of piling up a large residuum on the other side at the end of the debate. As I understand, that is the suggestion which the Senator from Nevada is making. In other words, the Senator from Nevada has occupied the floor for—I do not know exactly what the time was, but perhaps an hour and a half. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] occupied the floor on the other side for a few minutes. Of course, the Senator from South Carolina, if he so desires and thinks it is in accordance with the spirit of his own statute, can remain in his seat, and compel the proponents of the McCarran resolution possibly to exhaust their time, and then at the end of it to come in with a number of speeches on the other side, because at the end of 4 hours of debate in behalf of the concurrent resolution the time of the proponents would be exhausted.

It seems to me that all ordinary standards of fairness in debate should indicate that the time should be more or less equalized as the debate goes forward. Does not the Senator from Kentucky, from his long experience, think that is a fair proposal?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no ironclad rule about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no rule at all about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, that is customary. Of course, the Senator realizes the difficulty under which we now labor, and have labored for several days, in regard to the attendance of Senators and the interest of the Senate in what is going on. I do not know who is to speak on either side. I hope to make a few brief remarks, but I do not wish to do so today. I do not think I should be expected to do so today. Aside from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and myself, I do not know of any other Senator who intends to speak on that side of the question, although there may be others. Naturally, I would not know who is to speak on the other side, so it is a matter which it is not easy to dispose of merely by wishing. I do not desire to agree now to vote at 4 o'clock tomorrow on the assumption that we are to quit work now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, is the Senator from Kentucky willing to submit a unanimous-consent request along the lines suggested when we first met today, providing for a division of time on the subject, one-half the time to be controlled by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the other half by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], all the time which has been used today to be charged against the respective sides? Such an agreement would have the effect of concluding the debate on the subject tomorrow afternoon at approximately 4 o'clock, or shortly thereafter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I made such a request earlier in the day and it was objected to. I was told privately by one Senator that he would not agree to having one-half the time for debate controlled by one Senator and the other half by another Senator. He was unwilling to make that sort of agreement. When I know I cannot obtain an agreement, I do not see any use in putting the request. The request which I made was in accordance with what I consider to be the spirit of the law dividing the time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is the spirit of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Otherwise any Senator, if he wished, could obtain the floor and occupy half the time, without any other Senator being given an opportunity to speak. I do not think that is the spirit of the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, along the same line, any Senator could occupy all the time of his side at one session, and the other side would have all the remaining time. That seems to be the attitude.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. First, in response to what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has said, I cannot claim authorship of the provision in the law. The Senator from Missouri will recall that it was written in the House and came to the Senate. I heartily agree with him that the spirit of the law must be as he suggests. It is House practice. That is the explanation of it.

It was entirely agreeable to me to have the Senate agree to the proposal of the Senator from Nevada that half the time should be allotted by the Senator from Nevada and the other half by me. So far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that I have no intention to take up half the time on the side of those who are opposed to the concurrent resolution. My present intention is to consume only 15 or 20 minutes. Therefore I should not want to have any Senator gain the impression that by not offering to speak at this time my intention is later to obtain recognition and talk for 2½ hours. I have no such intention; and I should be very happy if the Senate would agree to the proposal of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I shall be glad to allot time to any Senator who desires to speak.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Kentucky again submit a unanimous-consent request to vote at 4 o'clock?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order to test the matter, I shall submit the requests one at a time.

I ask unanimous consent that the time still remaining for debate on the concurrent resolution be controlled by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] in favor of the resolution and by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] in opposition to it, and that the time already consumed be taken into consideration in determining the respective number of hours to which each side shall be entitled from now on. It would not be fair to divide the time equally from now on, because the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has already occupied considerably more time than has been occupied by the other side.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true. I had in mind the thought which was expressed earlier in the day, that a definite hour be set at which to vote. Along that line, I again suggest that the able Senator from Kentucky ask unanimous consent to set the time for voting at 4 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I said to the Senator, I am putting the requests one at a time. I think probably it is better to obtain an agreement for the control of the time uncomplicated by the other question.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am perfectly willing to divide the time, charging the side which I represent with the time we have occupied today, the debate to end at a definite hour.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I shall object to the proposed control of the time.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the notice to which I referred a moment ago when I said I was advised that I could not obtain such an agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Colorado objected to the request to divide the time.

Mr. ADAMS. I objected to the control of the time.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct—the control of the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, earlier in the day our leader on the Democratic side suggested the hour of 3 o'clock tomorrow for a final vote on the House concurrent resolution. At that time I made an objection, because I was not sure certain Members would be present. I suggested 4 o'clock as

the time for a final vote. I am still ready to enter into an agreement of that kind.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who is in charge of the matter as chairman of the committee, feels that 4 o'clock tomorrow, regardless of what happens for the remainder of today, will allow ample time, considering the time which has already been taken, I certainly have no objection to voting at 4 o'clock.

Mr. BYRNES. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, regardless of any agreements heretofore made as to the limitation of debate or the reduction of the time of debate from 10 hours to 8 hours, I ask unanimous consent that not later than 4 p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote finally upon the concurrent resolution now pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the unanimous-consent agreement which has just been entered into carry out the spirit of the law dividing the time, or is the division of time entirely out of the question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the statute provides that the time shall be equally divided. No method for dividing the time is provided in the statute. The present occupant of the Chair will ask each speaker as he is recognized whether he is for or against the concurrent resolution. That will be essential in determining whether or not one side consumes more than 4 hours.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that fixing the time for a vote tomorrow has no effect whatever on the provision of the statute dividing the time equally between the two sides.

Mr. BAILEY obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the benefit of the RECORD, the Senator from North Carolina will state whether he is for or against the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I shall speak against the concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. IV.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator for the concurrent resolution or against it?

Mr. BAILEY. I am against the concurrent resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does one who is against the concurrent resolution favor the McCarran proposal?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the purpose of this debate the time is divided between those for and those against the concurrent resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I may have misunderstood the Senator from North Carolina. I understood him to say that he intended to address the Senate in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. IV.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I am speaking against the concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. IV. I take it the concurrent resolution is what is before us.

Mr. President, I shall speak mainly for the purpose of explaining my vote. It is my judgment that upon a proper consideration of the status of this matter, Senators will feel compelled to vote against the concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. IV.

I should like to be heard by the Senate on this subject. We must consider it, Mr. President, in the light of the status created by order No. III. If we consider this situation in the light of that order, we will be driven to two conclusions, which I undertake to maintain here.

The first is that to vote for the pending concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. IV, and leaving No. III undisturbed, will have the consequence of practically

destroying the Civil Aeronautics Board; that Board will become *functus officio*. If Senators wish to do that, let them do it, but that will be the clear effect, and I intend to show it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question there?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Before the able Senator proceeds, appreciating his analytical ability, I hope he will discuss the question from the standpoint that order No. III rearranges from within, keeping the Civil Aeronautics Authority independent, while order No. IV takes away the independence of the Authority and puts it into a separate organization.

Mr. BAILEY. I intend to discuss the effect of order No. III, and I hope I may state its consequences fairly and clearly. But my second proposition is that to vote to disapprove order No. IV, leaving order No. III undisturbed, is to constitute Mr. Hester, the present Administrator, the undisputed czar of civil aeronautics in the United States; and I am opposed to that.

Those are my propositions. I came by way of these conclusions from reading the orders and reading the law of 1938 and by experience on the Commerce Committee in the period during which I have been a member of it, now 9 or 10 years.

In the first place, let us look at order No. III, and see what its consequences are, and, while looking at order No. III, let us see what the President had in mind.

In his message on the third plan of Government reorganization, filed with us on April 2, 1940, the President said:

I propose to clarify the relations of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the five-member Board of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

It was a clarification procedure.

The Administrator is made the chief administrative officer of the Authority with respect to all functions—

Note the all-embracing character of it—"all functions"—other than those relating to economic regulation and certain other activities primarily of a rule-making and adjudicative character which are entrusted to the Board.

That is all the power the Board would have.

This will eliminate the confusion of responsibilities existing under the Civil Aeronautics Act and provide a more clear-cut and effective plan of organization for the agency.

That is the President's motive; that is what he had in mind; and, in pursuance of that plan, in the same message of April 2, on page 7 of the printed pamphlet under the title of "Civil Aeronautics Authority"—and bear in mind this is plan No. III, which is not disturbed by the pending concurrent resolution—the President ordered:

Sec. 7. Functions of the Administrator transferred.—The functions vested in the Civil Aeronautics Authority by the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; the functions of aircraft registration and of safety regulation described in titles V and VI of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, except the functions of prescribing safety standards, rules, and regulations and of suspending and revoking certificates after hearing—

There are the only exceptions—

the function provided for by section 1101 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; and the functions of appointing such officers and employees and of authorizing such expenditures and travel as may be necessary for the performance of all functions vested in the Administrator, are transferred from the Civil Aeronautics Authority to and shall be exercised by the Administrator, who shall hereafter be known as the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

That order takes from the Board of Civil Aeronautics, headed by Mr. Hinckley, to which great honor has been paid here and to which the President has paid great honor, practically every function except the function of prescribing safety standards, rules, and regulations, and of suspending and revoking certificates after hearing. All the other functions are done away with at one stroke. Where do they go? They go to the Administrator, Mr. Hester. Are Senators ready for that? All the other functions go to him uncontrolled and unrestrained. No Cabinet officer is over him. He is a bureau and an authority all in himself; he has no board to guide him or department of the Government to direct him; he stands there, single and alone, with immense

power. So I have been amazed that such attacks as have been leveled here have not been made upon order No. III, and I am only saying that we must sustain order No. IV in order to save civil aeronautics activities from the consequences of order No. III.

Mr. President, this is a matter of the very gravest importance to this country. We are dealing with an activity the potentialities and possibilities of which are unimaginable. I should say that it is not unlikely that in a short time the principal transportation of passengers in this country will be in the air; and I would not be charged now with overstating it. I should say that a great portion of the mails and express and smaller articles of freight are not unlikely in a few years to be carried over our heads rather than on the rails or the road. There are many who would sustain me in that position. Our Government is dealing with this great industry in the presence of its first flush of activity and growth, and what we have to do about it is of inestimable importance.

Not only so, Mr. President, but civil aeronautics has a direct relation to military aeronautics, and we are just now beginning to realize, from tragic events across the Atlantic, that it may be we will discover, to our dismay and consternation, that from this time on wars are likely to be won from the air. We heard the Prime Minister of Great Britain explain in the Commons just a few days ago, in a desperate hour, that Great Britain had found it necessary to withdraw her ships and men from the shores of Norway because the Germans had superiority in the air. Civil aeronautics builds the plants. Civil aeronautics builds everything in an airship except the guns and the armament. Without a proper development of civil aeronautics, neither the Army nor the Navy will be in position to produce the ships of the air which we may find indispensable in the hour of crisis.

So again I undertake to impress upon the Senate the importance of this matter by saying that what we do about this resolution will have a direct effect upon the whole transportation outlook in our country, and also upon the whole outlook for our national defense. We cannot afford to make mistakes even for the next 6 months.

In that connection I wish to call attention to some statistics in the United States News for May 17, showing the comparison of pilots, ground crews, antiaircraft guns, and production capacity as between the United States and Germany.

Where we in the United States have two pilots, Germany has seven and a half. The ratio of pilots—and they are as indispensable as guns and machines—is seven and a half to two.

In ground crews, where we have one and a half, Germany has nine. She outranks us in the men who maintain the ships and attend them in the ratio of nine to one and a half.

In antiaircraft guns, for every one we have in this country—and we have only enough to protect one city, 300—Germany has 7; 7 to 1.

In production of aircraft, for every aircraft we are able to produce, Germany can produce 6—6 to 1, and 7 to 1, and 9 to 1.

And at the root of the production of aircraft and of pilots lies civil aeronautics.

So, Mr. President, if we have had an important matter before us this year, I think it can be said that no matter has outranked in importance this one.

Returning to my proposition, let the order of the President as to plan No. III stand, and we commit to Mr. Hester all of this, including the training of pilots. We are now training them all over this country. It is in contemplation that we shall shortly have 15,000 of our boys training to be pilots in our schools and colleges. I should not like to make the mistake of saying how many we have, because I do not know, but I think it is safe to say that at least 8,000 young men are now training as pilots under this Board; but order No. III turns it all over at one stroke to Mr. Hester.

Who is Mr. Hester?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator announced, when he started to speak, that he was against the resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. I am. I am speaking now against order No. III. There are two plans here, and I am going to speak for order No. IV as being indispensable to preserve this authority in view of the plain legal consequences, the inevitable consequences of order No. III.

I asked who is Mr. Hester? I have not the remotest intention of calling in question his character or his reputation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Plan No. III is law.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. Plan No. III is not law. Plan No. III will be law if we do not condemn it within 60 days from April 2.

Who is Mr. Hester? I was saying that I have no thought of reflecting on him. Sitting on the Finance Committee of the Senate, I have had frequent contacts with him. Sitting in the hearings on the Alcohol Control Act, I had contacts with him. I have no prejudice against him, and I should not think of saying here anything to his detriment; but I do say that he has never had a particle of experience in aeronautics, and all he knows about it is what he learned since he was made Administrator after the law passed in 1938.

Here is his record: He was born in Iowa, and his legal voting address is Montana. He attended George Washington University and received the A. B. degree. He also has an LL. D. from Georgetown University. Mr. Hester was a private in overseas service during the World War. His 20 years of Government career service include the following:

Law clerk, Emergency Fleet Corporation; junior attorney, Department of the Interior; assistant counsel, United States Shipping Board; counsel, office of the Alien Property Custodian; special assistant to the Attorney General; chief attorney, Department of Justice; assistant general counsel, Treasury Department; Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The last connection is the only connection he has ever had with civil aeronautics.

We will grant that Mr. Hester is a good lawyer. We will grant that he has done well in the Government service. He has risen. We will grant that he is a pretty good tax adviser; but under order No. III we are asked to place him in control of the training of pilots of all the airways, without anyone over him. I say that is asking too much of me. I say that must be corrected, and the only way before me to correct it is to correct it by order No. IV; and I sometimes think that is why the President sent order No. IV to the Congress.

Let us see whom Mr. Hester displaces. The Board of Civil Aeronautics is constituted of very excellent men. The nomination of every one of them came before the Committee on Commerce for confirmation, and it was not a formality. We examined them in the subcommittee with the utmost care. Some of them remained with us fully 2 or 3 hours; and it was disclosed to me, not only in those hearings but also by frequent personal contacts, that in Mr. Hinckley the President had discovered probably the very best man in America to look after civil aeronautics, a man of scholarship and of character and business experience, and who was a pioneer in civil aeronautics in this country. He was the founder and the organizer of the Utah-Pacific Lines, which proved a great success, and showed the way to many another development in this country. It would be a calamity to take these functions away from Mr. Hinckley, who is an expert, and place them in the hands of Mr. Hester, who could not possibly qualify as an expert except upon his experience as Administrator during the past 18 months; and yet that is the consequence of plan No. III.

Plan No. IV undertakes to correct that. I shall proceed to read the order for plan No. IV. I read from Reorganization Plan No. IV, as found on page 7, section 7:

Transfer of Civil Aeronautics Authority. (a) The Civil Aeronautics Authority and its functions, the office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and its functions, and the functions of the Air Safety Board are transferred to the Department of Commerce.

That was a necessity, in order to place a head and control over the one man to whom plan No. III had committed the whole business. I am for it. I would not wish to turn one

man loose with this great, new industry without anyone over him, even in quiet times, even when there is a stabilization, but heaven knows we cannot afford to do it now, when any mistake will amount to a blunder, and perhaps to a disaster.

(b) The functions of the Air Safety Board are consolidated with the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which shall hereafter be known as the Civil Aeronautics Board and which shall, in addition to its other functions, discharge the duties heretofore vested in the Air Safety Board so as to provide for the independent investigation of aircraft accidents. The offices of the members of the Air Safety Board are abolished.

Senators, that is a necessity. The President had to find something for the Civil Aeronautics Board to do. He had taken everything which they had to do away from them, and given it to Mr. Hester, and in order that they might not be *functus officio* he gives them this safety function, and I think they are capable of performing it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The testimony before the committee, I think, revealed the fact that if plan No. III became effective, and plan No. IV were nullified, the Administrator, whether it were Mr. Hester or someone else, would spend approximately 93 percent of all the money appropriated for the Administration.

Mr. BAILEY. That is in corroboration of my position. I say that it would make him the czar of the activity.

My second point was that since the Board of Civil Aeronautics had, by plan No. III, been stripped of all its functions, it was necessary for it to get something to do, and it was given the air-safety function. I do not object to that; I think it is a good thing. I do not think we need three wheels on this cart. So I shall vote for that. I am voting to give the activity over to the Department of Commerce, because it is necessary to have some control.

(c) The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, whose functions shall be administered under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, which shall report to Congress and the President through the Secretary of Commerce, shall constitute the Civil Aeronautics Authority within the Department of Commerce: *Provided*, That the Civil Aeronautics Board shall exercise its functions of rule making (including the prescription of rules, regulations, and standards), adjudication, and investigation independently of the Secretary of Commerce.

I am agreeable to that, too. It is a quasi-judicial body, and it should be clothed with independence.

Provided further, That the budgeting, accounting, personnel, procurement, and related routine management functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board shall be performed under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce through such facilities as he shall designate or establish.

The consequence of No. IV is to prevent the evils and undesired consequences of No. III. It puts Mr. Hester under the Department of Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. He is not under the Department of Commerce, upon the taking effect of No. III. I should like to have the Senator permit me to finish my argument. I will then answer any question he may desire to ask. I am not able to remain much longer.

Mr. McCARRAN. I was wondering whether the Senator would like to be set right.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; I should like to be set right. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator probably knows that a concurrent resolution against Reorganization Plan No. III is pending.

Mr. BAILEY. I knew that. So far as I know, it has not been seriously advocated on the floor of the Senate, it has not been entertained in the House. I think that is an answer to that. When we come to No. III, I will be right there, but I have to deal with the situation as it is, and the Senator today in his argument was attacking No. IV.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator vote for a concurrent resolution against Reorganization Plan No. III?

Mr. BAILEY. I would.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then the Senator has very cogent reasons for voting against No. IV.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, no; I cannot afford to take the risk, and I do not think any other Senator can. I do not think the junior Senator from Nevada, with all his devotion to aeronautics and all his interest in this proposed legislation, can afford to take that risk. We will come to the end of the session. If the Senator's concurrent resolution respecting plan No. IV prevails, with No. III in effect, and the Board out of power, and Mr. Hinckley gone—let me finish on that point.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator permit one more question?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senator, and this is my last question. The Senator is undoubtedly addressing himself to the personality of Mr. Hester. I might be in accord with him, but I did not have the appointing of Mr. Hester, nor did the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator made that remark. I am trying not to deal in personalities. I am dealing with officials. I gave Mr. Hester's record, and I took pains to say nothing in derogation. I spoke of Mr. Hinckley and his record, and I exalted him for the great work he has done, with which I am quite familiar, and I exalted him for his fine experience. Speaking of each of them, I was speaking of them as officials, and not with a view to discussing personalities. I am a friend of Mr. Hester. There has never been the slightest thing between him and me. I have sat on the Finance Committee, as our leader has, and heard Mr. Hester many times, and I will say that no one on that committee ever dreamed or suspected that the time would come when we would be called upon to sustain Reorganization Plan No. III and give him absolute control and full sway, without even the check of having to report to a Cabinet officer, over all the civil aeronautics activities, including the training of pilots, which have been put on foot by the Board and Mr. Hinckley throughout the country. That is the situation. I shall vote according to the situation as it is presented to me. If I had a chance to vote against both these plans respecting civil aeronautics, I would do it; but I have not that chance, and I have to take the situation as it is.

Mr. President, I have stated the situation, and the consequences. I come to one more thought. The President has made it known through Mr. Early, I take it, who, so far as anyone can, speaks for the President, that in the event of the approval of these plans, probably in any event, he will appoint Mr. Hinckley Assistant Secretary of Commerce, with a view to having Mr. Hinckley take charge.

Mind you, Mr. President, he cannot do that if plan No. IV is disapproved, for it is plan No. IV which puts Civil Aeronautics under the Department. That is another reason why I shall vote for plan No. IV. I am driven to it by my interest in the whole subject of aeronautics, civil and military.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator yield for one more inquiry?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator realize that if plan No. IV is voted down, plan No. III will fall of its own weight?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think so at all. They are separate plans.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is impossible to make plan No. III effective if No. IV goes out.

Mr. BAILEY. If plan No. IV filed here April 11, 1940, goes out, No. III will stay in, entirely separate and independent, and the proof of that is that we have a concurrent resolution here, which came from the House, which addresses itself wholly to plan No. IV. I do not think the Senator can sustain his contention, but I will be present to hear him when he undertakes to do so. It is not possible to destroy one Presidential order by voting down an entirely different one.

Mr. McCARRAN. Excepting that No. III is inoperative, in effect, and cannot go into operation of itself.

Mr. BAILEY. I read No. III to the Senate. I would not mind taking the time to read it again, and showing the Senator that it could be operated just as well, and it would be operated wholly by Mr. Hester, as Administrator, free and independent. That is what we have before us. I would not say it would be operated well; I would not say it would be

operated successfully; but I could say that he would go on with the matter until we met next January, and then we would pass a law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then, if I understand the Senator's implication, I take it he would be very glad to vote to put plan No. III and plan No. IV out of business.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator had been listening as closely as I thought he was, he would have heard me say that a few moments ago with a good deal of emphasis.

Mr. President, I have come to my final point. Mr. Early, as Secretary to the President—I will not undertake to speak further than that—announced at Hyde Park that the President intended to appoint Mr. Hinckley Assistant Secretary of Commerce, with the expectation that he would have the function of overseeing and supervising civil aeronautics. That is extremely agreeable to me.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator says he has nothing against Mr. Hester, and that so far as concerns Mr. Hester, the matter is not personal with him.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator says that Mr. Hinckley is agreeable to him. Does that not confirm the statement that it is a personal matter?

Mr. BAILEY. I think not.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, if Mr. Hinckley has charge in the Department of Commerce it is satisfactory, but if Mr. Hester has charge in the Civil Aeronautics Authority, it is not satisfactory.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator can take that view if he wishes to do so. I gave my reasons. I think I will restate them, because nothing can be lost by reiteration of the truth.

Mr. Hinckley is a man of long and successful experience in aeronautics; he is the man who has been conducting the affairs of the Authority with the greatest satisfaction. High tribute was paid here today to the fine record made by the air lines in the last 2 years. I am not going to claim all the credit for Mr. Hinckley, nor would I permit anyone to claim all the credit for Mr. Hester, nor would I stand still and see both of them together get more than 25 percent of the credit. I give the credit for the development of the industry to the men who operate the airways.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator would reduce that to 5 percent, he might get some accord.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to go a long way to agree with the Senator from Nevada, but I could not cut it down to 5 percent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. What has been troubling me is the charge or contention of some persons that the function of air safety can be exercised only by one little particular group. It seems to me that a function could be exercised by any group that wanted to exercise it properly. These individuals are mere humans. They will die some time or other.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may interrupt the Senator from North Carolina again, I will say in answer to the Senator from Texas that that is self-evident. The President could have removed every one of them in a twinkling of an eye, and he did remove one of them, because he was out of accord with the other two. He gave him a job piling gravel at Gravelly Point.

Mr. CONNALLY. I apprehend they will all be removed if this order is overturned.

Mr. McCARRAN. They can be removed now.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with my friend here that all men die, unfortunately, and new men carry on notwithstanding. It was said of old—

The workers die, but the work goes on.

No man is indispensable. I made no such contention. All I said was that Presidential Order No. III takes practically all the powers, except the promulgation of safety regulations, from the Civil Aeronautics Board, presided over by Mr. Hinckley; it takes the training of pilots from the Civil Aeronautics Board, presided over by Mr. Hinckley, an experienced man in the air industry, a man who has made a fine

record in Washington, a man who is here in order to do the job, and not to get a job; and places those powers in the hands of Mr. Hester, whose only record is that of a successful attorney in the bureaus at Washington.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I have been very much interested in what Senators have had to say about Presidential Order No. III and Presidential Order No. IV. I understand the position of the Senator from North Carolina is that the two orders are so inextricably bound together that they ought to stand or fall together.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator. I wish, Mr. President, that the President had sent the proposals to the Congress in one order.

Mr. BURKE. But if the Senate, in the exercise of its wisdom, should agree to the concurrent resolution disapproving Presidential Order No. IV, does the Senator from North Carolina have any doubt that the President would then withdraw order No. III? I find nothing in the statute that would inhibit that at all, and make it necessary for him to leave order No. III with us. The order does not go into effect until the 2d of June, and I would assume that the consequences of leaving order No. III in effect by itself, without order No. IV, would impress themselves upon the President as fully as they have upon the Senator from North Carolina, and as he has impressed me, and that the President would promptly see that order No. III never went into effect.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, that is highly speculative. I have heard people in this country debate and discuss for the last year what the President would do, but I have not yet found anyone who knew. [Laughter.] I am not going to assume, and I am not going to vote, on the theory of what the President will do until he tells me in unequivocal terms.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it the Senator is not referring to third terms when he speaks in that manner.

Mr. BAILEY. No; not in the remotest.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In case order No. IV is not permitted to become law, and order No. III still is the law, if it should not prove satisfactory, is it not likely that the President would issue still another order adjusting Presidential Order No. III to meet whatever conditions were necessary?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. I was about to respond to that question. If the Senator from Nevada wishes to respond first he may do so, or if he wishes to wait, I will respond now.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; but I will draw the attention of the able Senator from Texas, if I may, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina, to this point. The Senator says, "still is the law." Order No. III is not in effect.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; but if it should go into effect, and order No. IV should be killed, that would not exhaust the President's power. He could issue another order establishing another set-up, if he desired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; he could issue as many as he liked.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not know whether he could issue another effectual order or not. If Congress shall adjourn, as some think it may, within less than 60 days, and the President should issue an order, the order could not go into effect until the next session. The Reorganization Act expires by limitation early in January 1941.

I am unwilling, Mr. President, to proceed in this situation on theories or assumptions. I am proceeding on the simple fact that order No. III will have consequences which I do not think are good for aeronautics, or good for national defense, and that order No. IV will tend to avert those consequences, for we could, by way of confirming the appointment of Mr. Hinckley as Assistant Secretary of Commerce, restore to a position of great influence the man who I think

is entitled to more consideration at the hands of the Congress and the President than any other man in America.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD two telegrams which bear on the pending business. They were received by me within the hour.

The first is from Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 13, 1940.

WARREN R. AUSTIN,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We oppose transfer Food-Drug Administration by Reorganization Order No. IV from Department of Agriculture, where it has been efficiently administered for years. Farmers vigorously fought for legislation and administration by Secretary of Agriculture. Earnestly feel transfer unwise. Consequently urge you support McCarran resolution disfavoring Reorganization Order No. IV.

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,

Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

The second telegram is from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 13, 1940.

WARREN R. AUSTIN,

Senator, Washington, D. C.:

I have been told that the Senate will today start considering Senator McCARRAN's Concurrent Resolution No. 43, to set aside Reorganization Order No. IV, which proposes to abolish the Air Safety Board and the new Air Authority, and place the control of civil flying and air transportation back under the Department of Commerce. The American Federation of Labor, which includes as one of its affiliates the air-line pilots, heartily endorses the McCarran resolution. Since hearing about the President's latest reorganization proposal I have been deeply concerned and distressed. I have talked to many people about this and there doesn't seem to be any plausible reason for this action. The contrast between the safety record established since the Air Safety Board and new Air Authority took over, and the deplorable record of fatal crashes involving the loss of score upon score of human lives that occurred previously, is unmistakable. During the time the air industry was regulated by the Commerce Department there occurred 130 fatal air-line crashes, resulting in the death of 473 pilots and passengers. Against this stands the nonfatality world record of 1 year and 43 days, or 409 days, without a single fatality to crew or passenger since the new agencies started functioning only 20 months ago. This points definitely to the wisdom of leaving the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 status quo. If there ever was an issue that was both popular and right, this is it. In this situation the record speaks much louder than anything that could be said. The 1,450 air-line pilots that fly our air-line transport planes to the far corners of the Western Hemisphere are aroused, and they are all unanimous in the opinion that the Air Safety Board should not be abolished. When it comes to a matter of safety, the opinion of the workers, whether they toil on the ground or in the air, usually reflects the proper course to follow. The entire air industry, the air-traveling public, the press, and the public generally are unanimously for the McCarran resolution. Public opinion generally is unmistakably against Reorganization Order No. IV. In the interest of protecting our fine group of air-line pilots and their precious human cargo your support of McCARRAN's Resolution No. 43 is most earnestly and sincerely urged.

WILLIAM GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I suppose no other Senator wishes to address the Senate at this time. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over until the conclusion of the matter now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTER, MIAMI, FLA.—GEORGE E. MERRICK

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, earlier in the day the nomination of George E. Merrick to be postmaster at Miami, Fla., was favorably reported by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination. My colleague the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is in favor of the nomination, and I should like to have the matter disposed of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

MOUNT RUSHMORE MEMORIAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. BARKLEY. From the Committee on the Library, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 8357) to amend the Mount Rushmore Memorial Act of 1938, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, what is the nature of the measure?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a bill amending the authority under which the monuments at Mount Rushmore are being carved by Mr. Gutzon Borglum. It authorizes the appropriation of a little additional money. The bill was passed by the House, and it is important that it pass the Senate in order that the Committee on Appropriations may consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 8357) to amend the Mount Rushmore Memorial Act of 1938 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 14, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of April 24), 1940

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Royd R. Sayers, of Virginia, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, vice John Wellington Finch, resigned.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Grosvenor Francis Powell, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 1, 1935, effective July 16, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONELS

Lt. Col. James Roy Newman Weaver, Infantry, from May 2, 1940.

Lt. Col. John Porter Lucas, Field Artillery, from May 2, 1940.

Lt. Col. William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr., Infantry, from May 2, 1940.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Maj. Charles Everett Hurdiss, Field Artillery, from May 2, 1940.

Maj. Henry Hutchings, Jr., Corps of Engineers, from May 2, 1940.

Maj. Henry John Schroeder, Signal Corps, from May 2, 1940.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. William Robert Sweeley, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps), from May 2, 1940.

Capt. George Allan McHenry, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps), from May 2, 1940.

Capt. Seward William Hulse, Quartermaster Corps, from May 2, 1940.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of April 24), 1940

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

George E. Merrick, Miami.

MARYLAND

Kathryn T. Schaefer, Chesapeake City.

MICHIGAN

Nelson Joseph Coash, Romulus.

Rex. R. Royal, Shelby.

PUERTO RICO

Christina G. Sandoval, Hato Rey.

Juan V. Hernandez, San Sebastian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 13, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and Sovereign God of the universe, we approach Thy throne with the glad assurance that they who wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint.

May this be a day of unclouded vision for our President, for our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress, as they courageously seek to minister to the needs of our beloved country and the whole world.

Wilt Thou show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity, emancipating it forever from everything that defiles and degrades. We are praying for that glorious time when the spirit of man shall be too strong for chains and too large to allow itself to be imprisoned by selfishness, injustice, prejudice, bigotry, hatred, and all those sinister and debasing feelings and forces which are continually storming the citadel of our souls.

In the name of our Lord and Saviour, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 10, 1940, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter addressed to me by the Governor of New Mexico, Hon. John E. Miles, and a short speech made by him on the question of relief.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered. There was no objection.

AMERICA'S MOTHER OF 1940

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Yesterday was Mother's Day. Throughout the United States, as a result of a Nation-wide radio hookup, there was heard the voice of Mrs. Edith Graham Mayo, the widow of that beloved American surgeon, Dr. Charles H. Mayo. Mrs. Mayo spoke as the representative of the Committee for the Observance of Mother's Day. Last week, Mrs. Mayo was awarded the gold medal given annually by the Golden Rule Foundation to the mother selected as the American mother for the year.

The selection of the American mother is made as a result of nominations by individuals, clubs, churches, and other organizations. It is necessary for the candidates to have the following qualifications. "An unimpeachable character, an attractive personality, and a sense of social responsibility and of social and world relationship."

When the announcement was made to Mrs. Mayo that she had been selected for this honor she replied with characteristic modesty, "I am just scared." Mrs. Mayo is the mother of eight children, an adopted daughter, a foster son, and the grandmother of 22 offspring.

Mrs. Mayo accompanied by members of her family and escorted by a squad of Boy Scouts of the Parish Church of St. Bartholomew's Protestant Episcopal Church at Park Avenue and Fifty-first Street, attended the regular Sunday morning services at St. Bartholomew's. Later, in the afternoon, she delivered her talk from the studios of the National Broadcasting Co. in Rockefeller Center, New York City.

Mrs. James Roosevelt, mother of the President, introduced Mrs. Mayo as "America's Mother of 1940." Mrs. Roosevelt presented Mrs. Mayo as—

A life-long companion and helper of one of America's greatest surgeons and medical benefactors; devoted mother of 8 children and foster mother of 2, whom she reared in the atmosphere of love for God and love for neighbor; the understanding grandmother of 22 children who look to "Granny" for affection and comfort which never fail; sympathetic and generous helper of many people and causes, both in her own community and throughout the world; beloved of all who know her.

Briefly, Mrs. Mayo responded, in these words:

Nineteen hundred and forty may prove the most crucial year of modern history.

One-half the world is at war; no one knows how greatly the lives and happiness of our children and grandchildren who are to follow us will be determined by events which are taking place today in Europe and Asia. The world is now one neighborhood, and unless we can in some way make it one brotherhood, the future of our children is fraught with great danger.

Referring to the—

Untold myriads of mothers and orphaned children in Europe and Asia as well as in impoverished homes of our own land who are praying not for flowers but for flour; not for candies but for bread; not for greeting cards and telegrams but for medicine, sympathy, and the necessities of life—

Mrs. Mayo urged Americans to observe the Golden Rule and to—

Make this year memorable by doing for the wounded, robbed, and impoverished kinsmen and friends overseas or at home that which we would like to have done for us if conditions were reversed.

To this end Mrs. Mayo said that she would—

Like to see placed on every dining table in America an appropriate receptacle into which a coin of gratitude would be dropped every time an American family sits down in peace and comfort to partake of an unrationed, bountiful meal.

These Golden Rule tokens of good will should be sent to relief organizations, Mrs. Mayo said:

As a climax to this expression of world-wide friendship—

Mrs. Mayo continued—

I should like to see a truly great Christmas gift flowing from all the homes of the peace-blessed American republics and the Western Hemisphere into the refugee camps, hospitals, and war-shattered homes of Europe and Asia.

One could not have heard these timely and well-chosen words of this lovely lady without being impressed by her sincerity and simplicity of character. The whole ceremony was beautiful, and must have appealed to the vast audience that listened throughout the Nation. In Mrs. Mayo, there is

symbolized the spirit of America—peace, harmony, and love of fellow man. It was natural that her first public utterance would be an appeal for aid and assistance for the mothers of the world. The tone of her voice, and the depth of her appeal must have aroused the sympathy of every mother in America for the mothers of the world who are heart weary and sore at the ravages of war and destruction. The words of Mrs. Mayo will serve as a clarion call to even greater service and cooperation on the part of the women of America in all matters affecting the welfare of children and the home.

Since 1907, the second Sunday in May has been set apart as Mother's Day. In the beginning, it was started by Miss Anna Jarvis, of Philadelphia, as a memorial service for her mother. Since that time, the idea has grown, until today, it is not only observed in the United States but also in many other countries.

Love for one's mother is so deeply rooted in the heart of every person that we find men of all classes, races, and creeds united in celebration of Mother's Day. The celebration of Mother's Day is one that is not marred by sectional, political, or religious differences. We are all one in our desire to do honor to our adopted mother, Mrs. Edith Graham Mayo.

I have selected the following extracts from tributes to mothers—

SYMPATHIZES WITH WAR VICTIMS

The dreadful events of savage aggression during the last 48 hours continue to take our minds and hearts from many things they should be dwelling upon, but they must not divert us from commemorating Mother's Day—

the Reverend Dr. Minot Simons, the pastor, said in his Mother's Day sermon in All Souls Unitarian Church, Eightieth Street and Lexington Avenue:

The anguish of mothers at this minute in China and all over Europe fills our souls with the deepest sympathies we can feel. Today we must especially commemorate these mothers and the homes which they have made and which are now blasted from the earth. And with renewed courage and faith let us commemorate the homes which many of these mothers will rebuild and thus with all mothers carry on the most wonderful institution which the human race has created, always the index of character, always the symbol of civilization. Trace the evolution of the home and you have before you the evolution of society.

Rabbi Leo Ginsburg, speaking at the West Side Jewish Center, said that the greatness of the American Nation depends upon the mothers, who mold the character of their sons:

The greatest rank and honor on woman is the divine blessing of motherhood, a priestess of the home.

He declared:

The woman who sacrifices her family for a career is trading her birthright for a mess of poor pottage.

In the nobility of motherhood lies her service in giving so much and getting so little in return for what she gives. All her thoughts, visions, ambitions, and hopes are woven around her family like the inner border of an oriental prayer rug. The joy of raising a good family is her only compensation. Every true mother earns the distinction of the prophetess Deborah—"a mother in Israel."

It was Thomas Macaulay who wrote:

In after life you may have friends—fond, dear friends—but never will you have again the inexpressible love and gentleness lavished upon you which none but a mother bestows.

The Madonnas of Michelangelo and Raphael have held the world enthroned because the Madonna is the accepted symbol of purity and loveliness.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

All that I am or ever hope to be I owe to my mother.

May the observance of Mother's Day continue to grow until every American will pay proper homage to his own mother. Let Mother's Day become an established American custom and part of our American life.

Recently, I heard Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S. J., deliver an address entitled "Women of Ireland." In the following picturesque language, Father Gannon portrayed a mother who had all the qualifications for the honor that has been bestowed, this year, on Mrs. Mayo:

The badly planned Kellys, then, lived in a home-made tar-paper shack that was built in a rambling sort of way under an old oak

tree, down by the waters of the Upper Bay. But inside it was as clean as the heart of the mother that kept it; and the children, down to the baby, Barney, were all gentle and well behaved. Even on weekdays, when they didn't wear much, they still had some of their mother's innate refinement and dignity. And on Sundays when they passed our house in single file, the tallest going first, on the way to St. Peter's Church, there weren't many in the parish who wouldn't be proud to own them. It meant, of course, that Mrs. Kelly had worked far into Saturday night to iron out their shirts and ruffles and press their pants and brush their hats, but it meant, too, that she could keep her head unbowed amid sorrow that would have broken common clay.

She could be merry on occasion, too, and her hospitality was famous among the little ones. Nothing I knew gave quite the thrill that came into stealing down to the shack late in the winter afternoon when Mrs. Kelly was tired after a day at the tubs. She would sit us down on the floor in a row, the neighbors' children as well as her own, and hand out bread and butter with sugar on it. And nothing in the last 40 years has tasted half as good. Then she would light an oil lamp and take down from the shelf the only frivolous book in the house, Willie Reilly. She had a Bible, but we didn't care for that. We always called for the frivolous book, and she would read to us and we would sit there in the dusk, charmed by the music of her voice.

Put all that into symbols, and what have you got? Granuella, the tragic old Ireland that our grandfathers knew, sitting beside the ruins of her past, with the strings of her harp all broken, rags on her back, and tears on her face, but a light in her eye, and on her dear, dark head a crown which meant that her soul was still her own.

I am certain that the children of Mrs. Kelly, Mrs. Roosevelt, and Mrs. Mayo echo Mr. Lincoln's sentiments.

While America is blest with mothers of the type and character of Mrs. Kelly, Mrs. Roosevelt, and Mrs. Mayo, its future is secure.

I, now, ask the entire membership of the House to silently join with me in a toast. My toast and yours, too, I hope, for Mother's Day is a toast to our own dear mothers and to America's mother of 1940—may she ever remain enthroned in the hearts of her children, and may she always enjoy the smile of God. [Applause.]

SESSIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Committee on Naval Affairs will commence hearings tomorrow to ascertain the shipbuilding status and with reference to the expanded aviation program, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may sit during the sessions of the House during this week, with the understanding that when a roll call or vote is to be had, the committee will recess and come to the floor to vote.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time, and to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly at this time in the interest of continuity of service in the Congress. As I am retiring from Congress at the end of the present term, I can speak without any thought of personal gain in the matter.

If a man is honest, if he has average or above average ability and is industrious, then in fairness to him, in the best interest of his district and State as well as the Federal Government, his party at least should serve itself and honor him with renomination.

It has often been said that there is no substitute for experience. Under any system, ability plus experience is better than ability without experience. In no other field of service is this more clearly true than in the Congress of the United States. In addition, length of service gives one the advantage of seniority. Under the rules of the Congress, the majority party Member who has served longest on any committee becomes the chairman of that committee.

Let me use my own State of Texas as an example of what continuous service of Members in Congress can mean. One of the finest and most beneficial traditions in Texas is that of returning her Representatives to the Congress. Much has

been said in recent years of the power and prestige of the Texas delegation in the Congress. While I would not for one minute disparage the ability of my distinguished colleagues from Texas, I know from long years of experience and observation that such power and prestige as our delegation may possess comes more from years of service by the individual Members than from any other cause or causes. Other delegations get their effectiveness from the same source—long years of service and experience by its Members in the Congress.

In the House of Representatives we have 47 standing committees. Texas, with 21 Members in the lower House, holds 5 of these chairmanships. She is exceeded only by the Empire State of New York, which has 45 Members in the lower House and holds 6 chairmanships. Texans acquired these positions largely through years of service. SAM RAYBURN, majority leader from Texas, has served in the Congress for 27 years. HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has served in the Congress for 27 years. It has been my privilege to be chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I have served in the Congress for 23 years. JOSEPH MANSFIELD, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, has served in the Congress for 23 years. FRITZ LANHAM, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, has served in the Congress for 21 years. ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 3, is an exception to the rule, having served in the Congress only 4 years. Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, has served in the Congress for 23 years. Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, has served in the Congress for more than 37 years. Both Senators have outstanding records and are chairmen of important Senate committees. Then, our distinguished Vice President, JOHN GARNER, of Texas, has served in the Congress for 37 years. Two Texans hold positions next to the chairmanship—LUTHER JOHNSON on Foreign Affairs and EWING THOMASON on Military Affairs. Other Texans hold high positions on major committees. These positions are held by Texans because Texas has kept these men in Congress.

The same story is true of the nation generally.

ADOLPH J. SABATH, dean of the House and chairman of the Committee on Rules, has served 33 years. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, chairman of Appropriations Committee has served 31 years. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has served 29 years; CARL VINSON, chairman of Naval Affairs, 27 years; HENRY B. STEAGALL, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, 25 years; CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 23 years; MILTON A. ROMJUE, chairman of Post Offices and Post Roads, 21 years; JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, 19 years; SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, 17 years. This is true of all the important chairmanships in the House.

These men are all highly respected and greatly beloved. Their experience in the Congress makes their services invaluable.

Before leaving the subject of seniority as a prerequisite to the important positions of committee chairman, let us note the average period of service in the Congress of the committee chairmen from other States. The six chairmen from the State of New York have served an average of 12 years; the four committee chairmen from Missouri an average of 13 years; the four committee chairmen from Illinois an average of 16 years; the three committee chairmen from North Carolina an average of 21 years; and the three committee chairmen from California have served an average period of 12 years.

I think it might be well, also, to examine some individual committees over a period of years to see how important continuous service in the Congress has been. Let us examine four of the most important committees of the House for a period covering the last 40 years. During the last 40 years 8 men have served the Ways and Means Committee as chairman. These 8 men have averaged serving in the Congress for a period of more than 22 years each. Their average

period of service before becoming chairman of the committee was 17 years. During the last 40 years, 8 men have served the Judiciary Committee as chairman. These 8 men have averaged serving in the Congress for a period of more than 18 years each. Their average period of service before becoming committee chairman was 12 years. During the last 40 years, 10 men have served the Rules Committee as chairman. These 10 men have averaged serving in the Congress for a period of 25 years each. Their average period of service before becoming chairman of the committee was 18 years. During the last 40 years, 12 men have served the Appropriations Committee as chairman. These 12 men have averaged serving in the Congress for a period of 22 years each. Their average period of service before becoming chairman of the committee was more than 16 years.

In 1916 the then Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Champ Clark, of Missouri, made a notable speech to the Washington Press Club entitled "The Making of a Representative," in which he spoke of the importance of legislative experience. The speech is even more in point today than when made, and I quote a part of it:

It is a high honor to be a Representative in Congress, if for only one term, and with the number of terms the honor increases in geometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion. A Member's usefulness to his country should increase in the same proportion. A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

"Poeta nascitur non fit"—a poet is born, not made—says Horace; but Congressmen—that is, useful and influential Congressmen—are made largely by experience and practice.

The old Charlotte district in Virginia knew this and kept John Randolph of Roanoke in the House till he became a great national figure. Then the Old Dominion sent him to the Senate and General Jackson sent him to St. Petersburg. There are sporadic cases of similar action in other districts.

It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has the quicker he will get up. If he possesses these qualities, and if his constituents will keep him in the House, he is as certain to rise as the sparks are to fly upward. No human power can keep him down. It is only fair and rational to assume that every Representative's constituents desire to see him among the "top-notchers."

Let us take the present House and see how long the men who hold the high places have served. I cannot name all, but will cite a few as samples.

Mr. Speaker Cannon is serving his fortieth year. He holds the record, or, in pugilistic parlance, "he holds the belt," for length of service in the House in our entire history. In several Congresses he was chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and then was Speaker 8 years, only one man, Henry Clay, having been Speaker longer.

I am serving my twenty-second year; Minority Leader Mann is serving his twentieth year; Mr. Kitchin, chairman of Ways and Means, his sixteenth; Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations, his eighteenth; Mr. Moon, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads, his twentieth; Mr. Jones, chairman of Insular Affairs and "father of the House," his twenty-sixth; Mr. Flood, chairman of Foreign Affairs, his sixteenth; Mr. Hay, chairman of Military Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Glass, chairman of Banking and Currency, his sixteenth; Mr. Adamson, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his twentieth.

There are other big chairmanships, but these will suffice to show that as a rule the big places go to old and experienced Members, for most of the men who rank close to the chairmen are old-timers. The same thing holds good with reference to members of the minority. As an illustration, Messrs. Gillette and Cooper, who are serving their twenty-fourth year, are the ranking Republicans on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs, almost certain to be chairman thereof should the Republicans ever again have a majority in the House, as in that event, in all probability, Mr. Mann will be Speaker, unless he is nominated for President next June.

Go through the whole list and you will find, with few exceptions, that the men of long service have the high places.

In the second and third Congresses in which I served, Maine, with only four Members, had the Speakership and the chairmanship of the great Committees on Ways and Means, Navy, and Public Buildings and Grounds—a most remarkable circumstance, giving the Pine Tree State an influence in the House and the country out of all proportion to her population and wealth—these four men—Reed, Dingley, Boutelle, and Millikin—each served in the House 20 years or more. Other States might profit by her example.

The most able American writers on government have expressed themselves in similar vein. In James Albert Wood-

rum's book, *The American Republic and Its Government*, published in 1916, we find this statement:

The most distinguished congressional leaders are those who have sat for long terms by successive reelections.

Frederic A. Ogg and Ray P. Orman, in their able text, *Introduction to American Government*, in speaking of Members of the House, state:

Nowadays it is widely conceded that the term is not too long, but too short. The average person elected to the House for the first time has no acquaintance with the assembly's methods of doing business, has had no legislative experience—except possibly in a State legislature or a city council—and has only a superficial knowledge of the public affairs with which Congress is called upon to deal. Elected for only 2 years he cannot progress far toward becoming a useful Member, much less a leader, before his term expires.

Munro, in his book, *The Government of the United States*, published in 1923, says:

Seniority in service determines the chairmanship of important committees. * * * There are few walks of life in which experience counts for more than in politics. No one comes to Congress with an intuitive knowledge of what to do. The new Member is handicapped by the complexity of the rules and by a natural disinclination to push himself too far forward until he has acquired a sure footing.

While these things were true yesterday they are even more true today. While continuous service and experience were valuable in the legislative service of yesterday it is more valuable in the legislative service of today. Legislative experience becomes important in exact proportion to the expansion of business and the consequent activity of government to fit our expanded commerce. At the turn of the century most of the business and commerce of the country were within the limits of the respective States. Now much of it crosses State lines and has become a subject with which the National Government must deal.

Perhaps this increased responsibility, this growing complexity, is responsible for much of the complaint that one hears throughout the country in recent years that Congress has delegated to executive agencies too much of its power, too many of its prerogatives. Fear has been expressed that a proper balance as between the three branches of our Government no longer exists, that the system of checks and balances so wisely designed by our founding fathers is being destroyed, that the legislative branch of our Government is being dominated and controlled by the executive branch. The only way in which Congress can retain all of its powers, the only way in which it can escape domination by the executive branch of the Government, the only way in which it may serve successfully as a proper check upon the other branches of the Government is to retain at all times a large membership of experienced legislators.

A great American laid down a proper test for officeholders in a democracy as follows: Is he capable, is he honest, is he faithful to the Constitution? If a Member qualifies by this yardstick, then for all the reasons above discussed, and for many more, he should be reelected and reelected to that greatest legislative body in the world—the American Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I know that each and every Member of this House regrets exceedingly losing the chairmanship of the important Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]. [Applause.]

It has been my good fortune to have served with him during the entire 20 years that he has been a Member of the House. I have served with many, many outstanding, able, sincere, and honest men, but I will say that I have never served with a man who has been more sincere in serving not only his people but the entire country.

I know that each and every Member on both sides of this House wish him well and many pleasant years to come. I sincerely hope that he will not have the trials and tribulations on the bench that he has had in the House in his

efforts to pass the many, many beneficial bills in the interest of the farmers of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity go by without expressing our regrets at the departure from this body of our good friend MARVIN JONES.

I have had the opportunity to serve with him on the Committee on Agriculture for nearly 14 years. Our relationships have always been pleasant. While we may have differed at times in fundamental policies as to what was the best program for agriculture, our differences have not been political. We have worked together on that committee for what we believed to be for the best interests of American agriculture. When MARVIN JONES leaves this House and takes up his new duties in a higher place, we wish him well. The good wishes of all of us go with him in the new work that he is to undertake, and we hope that he will always have the best of health and will be able to carry on for many, many years to come. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

SUGAR QUOTA

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute, and I likewise request permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the fallacy of continuing in any form or fashion the sugar-quota system of control, which makes this country dependent upon offshore and foreign areas for 70 percent of its sugar supply, is more apparent today than ever before. The latest developments in the war situation in Europe have removed the last vestige of reason, if any ever existed, for the extension of the Sugar Act of 1937 beyond its present expiration date.

The New York Journal of Commerce, a recognized authority on sugar, last Saturday carried a late summary of the situation, which I quote in part:

ALL SECTORS IN SUGAR HIGHER AS WAR THEATER IS EXTENDED—FUTURES CLOSE 4 TO 7 HIGHER AFTER EARLIER GAINS OF 8 TO 11 POINTS—SPOT RAW UP 10 POINTS TO 2.90 CENTS

When the sugar market skyrocketed in September, it was anticipating the kind of warfare that developed yesterday in the extended areas of Holland and Belgium.

Today this same publication reports:

SUGAR CONTRACTS CONTINUE HIGHER—FUTURES UP 1 TO 4 POINTS IN ACTIVE TRADING—ACTUALS SELL AGAIN AT 2.90 CENTS

Continuing to reflect the possibilities of shipping difficulties, curtailed European beet crops, and damage to sugar factories as the result of the broadening of the war area, the sugar-futures contracts * * * ruled firm on Saturday. * * * With 600,000 tons of newly planted sugar in jeopardy in Belgium and Holland and considerably more in France and Britain, if the war spreads to those areas, and with the prospects that Java's supplies may be held up by shipping difficulties, traders were reluctant to sell the market except on an advancing scale.

The protection of the American housewife, Mr. Speaker, is one of the chief concerns of this Congress, as is the protection of this great country, by insuring an adequate supply of sugar—a strategic and essential war and peacetime material. I say to the gentlemen who advocate the continuation of the Sugar Act that so long as its provisions are in effect the grave danger of drastic shortage of sugar in this country is ever imminent.

The majority of this Congress will protect the American housewife and will further our national defense in every possible way. Our fight on sugar is a counterpart of our fight for national defense, and should legislation be brought on this floor to extend the Sugar Act of 1937 it would be a direct thrust at the very bulwark of our national defense. Such a thrust at our national defense and attempt to invade American rights will be met with the full force of the American people and those who endeavor to fairly represent them. I

hope that this Congress will not be made that battleground. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of rural electrification and include certain excerpts and statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE SHOE INDUSTRY

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, representing as I do some 20,000 Endicott-Johnson shoe workers, I am in a position to know the antagonism which public opinion in my district has for the methods of the Bata Shoe Co., now operating at Belcamp, Md.

I have here a petition signed by some 500 of the Endicott-Johnson shoe workers, and I will, with your leave, read it to the House:

Whereas the shoe-manufacturing industry in the county of Broome and State of New York has given employment to upward of 20,000 people during a period of years and has paid shoe workers wages permitting them to live according to American standards; and

Whereas for the last 3 years said shoe industry of Broome County, N. Y., has met with unfair foreign competition in the manufacture and dumping in this country of inferior shoes made by underpaid and poorly housed foreigners; and

Whereas the Bata Shoe Co. of Czechoslovakia, has constructed a huge factory at Belcamp, Md., and has imported a number of aliens to this country to manufacture shoes in competition with old-established American shoe-manufacturing firms:

Therefore we, whose names are hereunto subscribed, being all American citizens dependent directly or indirectly on the shoe industry in the county of Broome and State of New York, in the sincere belief that the Bata Shoe Co. of Czechoslovakia, at Belcamp, Md., in direct competition with us, constitutes a serious threat to the American standard of living and our continued well-being, and respectfully request that until conditions in the American shoe-manufacturing industry improve, that all of the alien employees in the Bata Shoe Co., of Czechoslovakia, be deported from the United States, and no more aliens admitted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNES, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. BREWSTER asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks.

THE JOHNSON ACT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has prematurely let the New Deal cat out of the bag by calling for the repeal of the Johnson Act.

I anticipate an active campaign from now on to undermine and destroy the Johnson Act, so that we may have the privilege of financing Europe's new war as we did the last. The only thanks we received for our huge loans to our former Allies was to be called Uncle Shylock and to have all the nations repudiate these war loans except little honest Finland.

I predict increasing propaganda to repeal or circumvent the Johnson Act in order to make new loans to the Allies, which will destroy American neutrality and eventually involve us in war.

Instead of weakening the Johnson Act, the Congress should stop the loopholes whereby loans and credits may be extended to foreign nations by our governmental agencies.

The repeal of the Johnson Act would mean sending our dollars abroad, to be followed by American soldiers to foreign battlefields.

I repeat what I said the other day, that I hope that President Roosevelt and the administration will not be criticized during the height of this war crisis without real and ample justification. I do not wish to convey the impression, how-

ever, that there should not be a continuous demand by the American people to keep us out of war and to prevent the repeal or modification of the Johnson Act. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein some resolutions regarding freight differentials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an article from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook entitled "Relief and Employment, Pennsylvania Shows the Way Out."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

FIGHTING SUBVERSIVE DOCTRINES

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the American people were amazed at the seeming ease with which the Nazi war machine conquered Denmark and subdued Norway. We were left stunned and dismayed when we learned of the treason and sabotage that made possible the subjugation of such proud nations with scarcely a struggle. Are we going to sit idly by while subversive groups, asking protection of their civil liberties, carry their un-American propaganda throughout this country? Are we going to continue to complacently permit the spread of foreign ideologies into our schools, our factories, and our everyday life? I do not think so.

We are appropriating huge sums to build a powerful Navy, a well-trained and equipped Army, a splendid air force. The morale of our fighting men is the envy of all nations. To these men and to the American people we owe a pledge of unceasing vigilance against the infiltration of subversive doctrines into our national program. Let us call upon our Federal officials and their various agents to seek out and get rid of the leaders of all those groups who would change the American form of government. They may be welcome in other parts of the world, but we do not want them here. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an article from the Chicago Sunday Tribune entitled "America and Europe."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an article on the social-security law written by Dr. Townsend.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

VETERANS' WIDOWS AND ORPHANS BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of House Resolution 444.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Andrews	Dunn	Kirwan	Shanley
Barton, N. Y.	Durham	McDowell	Sheridan
Bolton	Elliott	Merritt	Smith, Ill.
Brooks	Ellis	Moser	Smith, W. Va.
Buck	Flaherty	Mouton	Starnes, Ala.
Bulwinkle	Ford, Thos. F.	Murdock, Ariz.	Sumners, Tex.
Crosser	Fries	Pace	Sweeney
Crowe	Gearhart	Randolph	Tenerowicz
Crowther	Gifford	Risk	Thorkelson
Culkin	Gilchrist	Rockefeller	Weaver
Darden, Va.	Green	Rodgers, Pa.	Wheelchel
Darrow	Harrington	Rogers, Okla.	White, Idaho
Disney	Hendricks	Sandager	White, Ohio
Douglas	Horton	Schiffler	
Drewry	Houston	Secombe	
Duncan	Jarman	Shafer, Mich.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VETERANS' WIDOWS AND ORPHANS BILL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] moves to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 444. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is entitled to be recognized for 10 minutes. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] desire recognition?

Mr. SABATH. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H. R. 9000) was reported unanimously by the Veterans' Committee, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point at my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this measure was reported unanimously by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The committee at the same time instructed its chairman to use all possible means of bringing the measure to the floor of the House for consideration at the earliest possible date. At that time there was a petition in the well to bring to the floor of the House a much more drastic measure. As chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and in obedience to that mandate, I sent a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rules on April 2 asking for a rule on this measure.

I did not get a reply, nor did I get a rule. So at the expiration of the time required under the rules of the House a petition was filed in the well asking that that measure be brought to the floor for consideration and passage.

That petition was signed by the requisite number, 218, within 48 hours, I believe; certainly in less than 3 days; and when the poll was closed, so to speak, or when we reached the 218, there were about 10 Members, both Democrats and Republicans, standing in line ready to sign.

This being the first day the measure is in order, I have called it up, and, of course, the first vote will come on the motion to discharge the Committee on Rules. Let me say that this is not a reflection on the Committee on Rules any more than it would be a reflection or was a reflection on the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for Members to sign the petition to discharge my committee or a committee over which I presided. This is a representative body. Every Member here has his own responsibility. The chairman has his additional responsibility, and in doing what we have done in this particular case we have simply met those responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has made a fair and, I am satisfied, a correct statement as to why the discharge petition is presented today. It is true he sent me, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, a letter requesting a hearing, but I do

not recollect whether it reached my office on the 3d or 4th of April. I know that the bill was introduced on March 20, it was reported on March 25, and a resolution for the rule introduced on the 29th. Therefore the gentleman from Mississippi has not lost any time. Unfortunately, or fortunately, the State of Illinois held a primary on April 9 and I was not here when that letter reached the office; consequently I could not acknowledge it and I could not assure the gentleman how soon hearings might be had on his request for a rule. But I say to the House that the Rules Committee has not been negligent nor has it refused to report rules where a real demand is made. We have today 12 special rules outstanding. We have held hearings on some other bills and resolutions and have requests for about 40 other hearings on various resolutions.

The Rules Committee, even with the best of intentions, cannot grant immediately all the rules that Members or committees request, even though a unanimous report has been presented.

The Rules Committee has been created for the purpose of expediting business and it has been my aim to expedite business; therefore I have opposed individual Members coming before the committee demanding and obtaining rules, because if that course were pursued the Rules Committee would be all powerful. It could take away from the legislative committees their functions, rights, and prerogatives. As chairman of the Rules Committee, I have taken a position not of granting such rules and assuming such powers.

It is a fact, perhaps an unfortunate one, that we have in this House seven or eight committees so constituted that any legislation pertaining to those committees is bound to receive favorable consideration. We have this committee of which the gentleman from Mississippi is chairman. We have, in addition, the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the Committee on Roads, and the Flood Control Committee. The membership of those committees is constituted of gentlemen who are especially interested in such legislation, and invariably the bills are hurriedly reported, and quick action is demanded. This bill comes in that category. I have given you the dates already.

Mr. Speaker, it is a most unpleasant thing for me to be placed in this position today, because I have voted for all legislation that is in the interest of the World War veterans; in fact, I have voted for all helpful, beneficial legislation for the Civil War veterans, the Spanish-American War veterans, as well as the veterans of the World War.

I realize it matters not what I might say, the motion to discharge the Committee on Rules will be agreed to. I have asked many Members whether they desire any time in opposition to this resolution, but, fortunately, I have not been pressed for a great deal of time against the resolution, the reason being that every member of the Rules Committee is in favor of the bill. Therefore I am here merely to explain the position of the Rules Committee. At the same time, I wish to assure the Members of this House that it is not the intention of the Rules Committee to deny a rule for any bill that has been properly considered and reported, and where the committee has instructed that a rule be requested.

I am satisfied that when the vote is taken on this resolution it will carry almost by a unanimous vote and that the bill will pass by nearly a unanimous vote—this notwithstanding the politics-playing officers of the American Legion. I hope it will not even be necessary to have a roll call.

Having explained my position and the position of the committee, I shall conclude with this statement. We are apt to, and I hope we shall shortly adjourn. If there are any other gentlemen or any other committees who feel they are entitled to a special rule on any bills, I suggest that they not delay but make their requests in due time, or they may be too late. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BALL] the remainder of my time.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, the measure which this rule would make in order appears to have the endorsement of organizations for which I have profound respect and deep and lasting affection, but I feel impelled to oppose it just the same.

As a soldier who served overseas in the last World War I am aware of what war means. I have no illusions as to its grandeur and its glory. I realize vividly its pain, its dirt, and its despair. Those of my comrades who gave their lives, or who are, even now, living sacrifices, will ever remain heroes to me. To their dear ones we owe a debt that cannot be paid in dollars and cents, but as a feeble attempt on our part to make their lot easier we might well double, or treble, their present meager allotment. However, I cannot for the life of me see why the other widows and orphans are any different from the widows and orphans of the miners, the mill hands, the molders, or the farmers.

The fact that an American citizen served his country in its armed forces in its time of need, was discharged as physically fit, and in many cases the better for his military service, resumed his previous occupation, received from a grateful Nation a bonus bond redeemable in cash, should not, in my humble opinion, entitle him or his family to any further assistance from his Government.

The notion that the country owes its citizens, or any group of them, anything more than reasonable protection in their peaceful pursuits, and the right to seek their own salvation, is one that has grown more popular in the last few years, but it is still a notion fraught with danger. I am old fashioned enough to believe with my whole heart that my country owes me nothing, but rather that I am in her debt. If she needs me, it is my duty to come to her help at once, to serve her willingly without thought of reward or recompense, to protect and defend her against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and, when my services are no longer required, to return to my own affairs and live my life in peace and quietness.

This legislation is permeated with the thought that a certain group of the body politic should be given annuities solely because their menfolk did their duty to their country in time of war. It is an attempt, though perhaps an unwitting one, to undermine the very principles of equality for which our fathers died, and it is being made by those who should know better. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, I desire to say that this bill was not hurriedly reported. We began hearings on the 3d of February, and the bill was reported on March 20 or 21, I believe. In our committee, when we get through amending a bill, we introduce a new or a "clean" bill in order to bring a "clean" bill to the floor of the House. This measure was thoroughly considered.

In reply to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BALL], I want to say, and I should like for this to go to the press and to the country, that no bill that has ever been reported by this committee since I have been its chairman would ever redound to my benefit or to the benefit of anyone dependent upon me.

We appreciate the patriotism of the gentleman from Connecticut, but I want to remind him that there are thousands of young men who came back from the World War injured, diseased, disabled, and with insidious maladies of which they were not conscious and which many of them denied because they did not want to be put in the position of asking for anything at the hands of their Government. Many of them sleep beneath the soil of Mississippi and Connecticut, and every other State of this Union. As far as I am concerned, their widows and orphans are not going to the bread line or be forced on relief. If this bill passes, they will be cared for.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This is the widows and orphans' bill, is it not?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to say to the gentleman and the House and the country that I am for it. It is

said that it costs too much, but we have taken care of the widows and orphans of every war this country has ever fought.

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot yield further.

Mr. Speaker, there are two distinguished former members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation who cannot be here today. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] has wired me to say for him that he is for this measure. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN], a former member of the committee and a former commander of the American Legion of the State of Alabama, is unavoidably absent. He has wired me to say that if he were here he would support the measure.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has sent the same message.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 444.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 444

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 9000, a bill to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9000) to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9000, with Mr. HOBBS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour of the time to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill (H. R. 9000) provides compensation for the dependent widows and orphans of veterans of the World War. We are following the example set by former administrations. About the same time had elapsed after the Civil War before the first bill passed providing pensions for widows and orphans of non-service-connected veterans of that conflict.

Twenty-three years after the Spanish-American War a bill was passed providing compensation for widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans, without regard to service-connected disabilities and without regard to needs.

About 1929 we brought to the floor of the House what was called the Rankin bill, to advance the presumptive period from 1925 to 1930 so as to take care of all men who broke down within that period. That bill passed this House by a vote of 324 to 49. It passed the Senate by a vote of 66 to 6, exactly 11 to 1. It was vetoed by the President and that veto was sustained under the promise that a measure would be brought out immediately to take care of the situation.

Within a few moments the disability allowance bill was brought to the floor, providing \$40 a month for totally disabled veterans without regard to service connection, and I believe \$24 a month for 75-percent disability, and \$18 a month for 50-percent disability, and \$12 a month for 25-percent disability. This measure passed overwhelmingly, but the trouble was it left out the widows and orphans.

These men who came home, not knowing what their rights were, and went back into the fields and factories and later broke down and died, did not know until it was too late that they must make their application by a certain time. We had large numbers of veterans who contracted tuberculosis or broke down with other insidious diseases, but did not know of their troubles until it was too late. When they had passed away their widows and orphans were shut off without a penny. They are the ones I was trying to take care of then. Later, when the economy bill came along, it stripped all from that bill except the ones with 100-percent disability, and reduced their compensation to \$30 a month. Therefore we found these widows of World War veterans, many of whom incurred the disabilities from which they died in the service, were being turned out and forced to seek the relief rolls. Many of them with little children were forced to seek the relief rolls or the W. P. A. rolls or any other rolls on which they could secure a livelihood. Therefore, we held hearings and brought this bill out, and in order to avoid the pitfalls of former administrations we put a limit on it as to those widows who had no children.

There are today about 66,000 widows of the Civil War on the Federal pension rolls and about 6,000 veterans. Thousands and, probably, an overwhelming majority of these women never had any children by the veterans, and that is the situation that has brought about so much criticism. So we provide that any widow, without children by the veteran, but who was married to him prior to July 3, 1921, the legal date of the closing of the World War, shall be taken care of. How? By being given exactly the same compensation as was given to the widow of the Spanish-American War veteran 23 years after that war closed—\$20 a month. But for the widows who have children by the veterans—and they are the most pathetic cases—we provide that any widow who married the veteran prior to May 13, 1938, and who had children by him, shall receive the same compensation as did the Spanish-American War widows, \$20 a month, with \$8 for the first child, \$6 for the next one, and \$4 for each additional child.

I submit that in my humble opinion this bill will take large numbers of women and children from the relief rolls. The widows of World War veterans, the widows of veterans who honorably served their country in time of war, should not be forced to seek the relief rolls in order to get something to eat.

I know that there is a great wave of propaganda going through that element of the press that is trying to drag us into the present European war. Why, if we were to go into this European war, it would cost more in 1 month than this bill will cost the American people for the next 30 years.

Besides that, much as our sympathies may go out to our friends, this is not our war, and the American people expect Congress to keep out of it and not to become stampeded into it by this wave of inspired propaganda now going on through the press and through these international columnists and these international radio announcers and this international group that now controls the moving pictures of the country. The people are expecting us to keep our country out of this war.

We are told that this is a raid on the Treasury when we try to take care of these widows and orphans in this way. Someone has complained that we are also taking care of the dependent parents and saying that they were not disabled during the war.

Mr. Chairman, nobody suffered more in the World War than those mothers and fathers who saw their sons march away to fight on foreign soil. Talk about the suffering the soldier goes through—the man who dies in the blinding flash

of an enemy's gun in the excitement of battle under the enthusiasm of his comrades. Why, he does not suffer anything as compared with the misery the mother goes through day after day and night after night. Besides, we have come to the time in this country, whether you like it or not, when the American people demand that we take care of the aged, and especially the ones who furnish the sons who fight our battles in wars declared by the Congress of the United States.

Oh, they tell us that they are taken care of through social security. As a matter of fact, the social security does not reach the great farming element of this country; it does not reach the independent merchant; it does not reach the independent filling-station operator; it does not reach the independent man who is out doing his own work and does not depend upon the other fellow's pay roll. What it does is to pile up the cost of manufactured articles for him to pay. The millions of farmers throughout the Nation who do not come under the social security are expected to pay the bill in the increased price of commodities that industry produces.

But it is said that we provide for old-age pensions. Even in the agricultural States, those States that have been drained by indirect taxes until they are unable to put up the full amount, the old people are turned off with a pittance of anywhere from \$5 to \$10 a month, while in the more fortunate States where there is more wealth the pension runs as high as \$30 or \$32 a month. This is one of the most reasonable provisions of the bill.

But they come back and tell us that it will cost so much. I submit that their figures are too high. Judging from the estimates we have had from the Veterans' Administration in the past, I would say that the ultimate cost of this bill for the first year would be anywhere from six to ten million dollars, and millions of dollars of that will merely be taken out of the other pocket to pay old people who otherwise would be on relief or on the W. P. A.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman refers to the figures of the Veterans' Administration. It is my understanding that the figures submitted by the Veterans' Administration on legislation of this character have not varied more than 1 percent of error.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the gentleman is wrong.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman well remembers when I introduced a bill some years ago, to provide for those suffering from chronic diseases, such as heart trouble, that the Veterans' Administration said the bill would cost \$72,000,000. A few years afterward, and I have the letter in my office, General Hines wrote me that a bill somewhat similar, which included more diseases, would cost only \$32,000,000. Many mistakes have been made by the Veterans' Administration in that respect.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not blame the Veterans' Administration. It has to play safe. If you recall when we passed—I think it was 484, a few years ago to take care of the widows and orphans of veterans having service-connected disability, but who died from other causes—the estimates were several times what the first year's expenditures finally proved to be. If the principles of this bill are carried out, you will not have any raid on the Treasury. I heard over the radio last night or the night before, and I have seen it since in the press, that we were getting ready for a raid to pension veterans, whether they had disability or not. Nobody ever heard of that except some propagandist on the other side of the proposition.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not a fact that there is a bill before the gentleman's committee today introduced by the veterans of foreign wars asking for a pension for all World War veterans at age 65?

Mr. RANKIN. When the gentleman has been here as long as I have he will know that introducing a bill is very different from having a bill passed and made a law.

Mr. MILLER. But the gentleman said there was no bill of that kind.

Mr. RANKIN. There has been no pressure for that bill.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman answer the question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] former president of the World War veterans.
Mr. MILLER. But I am asking the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman know of any major veterans' organization that is advocating a pension for all World War veterans at the present time?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I signed a petition to bring this bill out with the understanding that it had also a necessity clause in it.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, it has a dependency clause.

Mr. MAY. I wish the gentleman would comment on that.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not true that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has such a bill as I have described before you?

Mr. RANKIN. They may have.

Mr. MILLER. Officially, I mean.

Mr. RANKIN. No. They do not introduce bills themselves. Congressmen introduce them.

Mr. MILLER. Well, by their request.

Mr. RANKIN. There may be a bill here. There is probably a bill for everything on earth you can think of before the various committees of this House.

Now, I am going to answer the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. Another thing, when you passed these bills for Civil War widows and for Spanish-American War widows, you did not require them to show that they were in need. This bill has that provision. It has that additional safeguard. So there is no danger of its running away.

This bill has the support of the leading veteran organizations of America.

I yield now to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. The bill to which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is referring is H. R. 7980, which is known as the disability bill.

Mr. RANKIN. What is that the gentleman has in his hand?

Mr. COSTELLO. This is the magazine Foreign Service.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not doubt there is a bill before the committee for every kind of veteran law you can think of, but there is not the slightest danger of any bill coming out of that committee now, or at any time in the near future, to put everybody on the pension roll who was in the service at any time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does the gentleman expect to explain this "needs" clause? I wish he would.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. General Hines said that they construed this clause—that is, the dependents clause—we did not say "need." We said "dependent widows, orphans, and dependent parents."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In that connection, I understand the gentleman differentiates between the "needs" clause and "dependents." In other words, they must be dependents?

Mr. RANKIN. Dependents, yes; and the Administration's rule is that they must not have an income in excess of \$50 a month. That brings it down to a narrow margin. I cannot understand how any man who is really in sympathy with these widows and orphans could object to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. How is that "needs" clause applied to the veteran who has other sources of income that will take care of the budgetary needs? For instance, in Massachusetts we have a soldiers' relief law which provides that the widow gets \$40 a month. Under this bill it provides \$25, I understand.

Mr. RANKIN. Twenty dollars.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. How will that affect the recipient of soldiers' relief in Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In Massachusetts it has always been the custom for the soldiers' relief to give less if the veteran is getting any kind of pension. So the State will be relieved just that much in cost.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The lady does not mean that the State of Massachusetts, which pays out \$2 for every dollar it gets back, will be relieved of any taxes?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It will be relieved that much in Massachusetts and other States of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, that does not apply to Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It will apply to Massachusetts, because it reduces the cost that much.

Mr. RANKIN. This American Veterans Association seems to be financed by a little group in New York who keep harping on the fact that we are not taking care of our service-connected disabled veterans. I have the record before me here. A man who came out of the Civil War with both legs off and both arms off 25 years after the war would have received only \$30 a month. Today a man with both legs off receives \$150 a month if he lost those legs in the service. If he has one leg and one arm off, I believe he gets \$150, whereas the old Civil War veteran would only have received \$30 a month.

All this apparent sympathy for the service-connected disabled veteran has been dragged in here in order to try to cripple this bill. We never heard from that source when we were battling back there in the days of Royal Johnson to take care of these service-connected disabled veterans.

Another thing: They are raising a great hue and cry about what they call the bonus—the adjusted-service certificates. That was back pay that we said we owed the veterans; and we did. When you were passing a bill to refund the foreign debt, when you gave Europe \$6,200,000,000, that movement was backed by every big newspaper that is today lambasting this bill.

The so-called bonus was money we owed the veterans for their services for the time they were in the war. It was adjusted compensation.

If that measure were before my committee, I would bring out a bill not limiting it to the wives, fathers, mothers, and children, but where there were none of those dependents I would see that it went to the veteran's estate or to his dependent brothers and sisters, if he had any.

Thousands of those veterans owed doctors' bills and hospital bills, but because they had neither father, mother, wife, nor child, their brothers and sisters have never been able to collect the money that was owed them for their adjusted service during the war, even though the disability from which they died may have been incurred in line of duty.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. TERRY. I understand there is a bill pending before the committee, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], which gives the widows of men who were killed in action or who suffered from service-connected disability an increase over what they get at the present time, I believe, up to \$60 a month. Will the gentleman kindly tell the Committee the present status of that bill? I would like to say that I am very much in favor of providing adequate care for these widows.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from California that if you raise the present compensation to \$60 a month, it is just a matter of time until some man will rise on the floor and move to strike out the phrase "service connection," and then you have them all on \$60 a month. We have had this problem to deal with before the American Veterans' Association was ever created to fight legislation of this kind. Last year we brought in a bill to give increases to the widows and orphans of veterans who died from service-connected causes. That did not come from the American Veterans' Association. The Amer-

ican Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans' Committee worked it out.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that at the first session of this Congress we increased the statutory award to amputation cases from \$25 to \$35 a month?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly; if they were service-connected cases. And, as I said, we increased the compensation for widows and orphans of veterans who died from service-connected causes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am not satisfied with the explanation I got. In the bill, after the first paragraph, when you get down to the meat of the bill, it says "subject to the limitations of paragraph 2 thereof." We do not have that before us.

Mr. RANKIN. No. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that that is the provision that limits payment to the ones who do not have an income of \$1,000 a year or over. Subsequently we inserted the word "dependent," which brings it within the rulings of the Veterans' Administration, which provides that their income must not be above \$50 a month.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Just one further question, if the gentleman will permit. Does that mean that if this bill passes that it will be within the province of the Administrator to determine what dependency means?

Mr. RANKIN. No; not if they accept that limitation. They must not have an income above \$50 a month.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand in some cases General Hines may decide that an income of less than \$40 a month would not constitute dependency.

Mr. RANKIN. My understanding is that they are held to be dependent if their incomes do not exceed \$50 a month.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So it might be less than \$40 a month under certain conditions.

Mr. RANKIN. No; if their incomes are less than \$40 a month, they would be considered dependent and would come under the provisions of this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it may be that I shall not consume all the time allotted to me by the courtesy of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. This matter will be discussed back and forth for the next hour and a half or a little more. It is not my intention to go very deeply into it. Perhaps I should content myself by imposing upon the Members of the Committee the text of a letter which I wrote to some American Legion officials in my district, the Thirty-ninth District of New York, and which, since its writing, has been published in a good many of the papers in that neck of the woods. I wrote to this gentleman, for whom I have the greatest respect, as follows:

This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of the 18th, in which, on behalf of the American Legion of Livingston County, you urge me to support the World War widows and orphans' pension bill now pending before the House of Representatives. I appreciate your telegram and the sincerity of conviction which actuated you and your fellow legionnaires in sending it.

I would feel much more comfortable if I could find it possible to agree with you in support of the bill in question. It is not pleasant to disagree with some of one's neighbors and constituents. In this case my convictions run so strongly that in justice to myself, and more especially in justice to you, I must be frank and say that I cannot support the bill.

You probably know that it provides for the payment of pensions to the widows and dependent children and parents of any veteran of the World War, regardless of the cause of his death. This is a very, very broad provision. I have grave doubts as to its justice. The country owes a debt of gratitude to the men who died in the service or who were disabled in line of duty. We must always take care of them and their dependents. Moreover, I think it right that the Government should afford hospitalization to veterans who fall ill and do the best possible in restoring them to health. However,

when it comes to giving pensions to widows and dependents of veterans who die from causes entirely disconnected from their war service, it seems to me we would be establishing or restoring a precedent which would set up a pension system so vast as to threaten the financial stability of the Government.

I am sure you will agree with me that there must be a limit to these things. If we impose still heavier burdens upon the tax-paying neighbor of the veteran, the former himself is apt to collapse—there being a limit to his economic endurance. The people who earn a living and pay taxes today are fearfully hard pressed. I recall, for example, that there are something over 300 farms in Livingston County alone which are up for tax sale. Surely we must go very slowly and cautiously in our consideration of these proposals for a wide extension of the pension system.

As for the Government itself, the national debt is rapidly approaching the debt limit, \$45,000,000,000. Of every dollar it spends the Government borrows about 50 cents. The deficit of this present fiscal year is estimated at four billions. Already it is apparent that the Congress will have to lift the \$45,000,000,000 debt limit unless the rate of expenditure is very sharply restricted. Just at present it appears as if we were bound to go on plunging along the reckless road for at least a year to come.

Mr. Chairman, this letter was written on April 19. Were I to write it today I would not restrict the plunging for a year to come; it will run far beyond that.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot yield at present.

This pension bill which is being urged upon the Congress will, it is estimated by the Veterans' Administration, involve an annual expenditure of \$48,000,000 for the first few years. That this sum will increase very substantially thereafter there can be no doubt. This is just one of the additional burdens which the Congress is urged by various groups of people to impose upon the Treasury. If the Congress yields, and I fear it will in some instances, it may bring about an economic collapse and thereby inflict upon all our people, including the veterans, a degree of distress and suffering hitherto unknown.

Frankly, when I see that huge debt, when I note the effect of present tax burdens, Federal, State, and local, the discouragement of enterprise and the multitude of unemployed, I am alarmed. In the face of such conditions I am tempted to urge World War veterans—good soldiers and good citizens—to forbear.

I am writing you in this fashion, first, because I respect your views and, second, because you are entitled to an expression of mine.

Sincerely yours,

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, about 10 years ago I introduced a bill in this House providing for pensions for dependent widows and children of deceased World War veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert that bill at this point of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The bill referred to follows:

[H. R. 16954, 71st Cong., 3d sess., in the House of Representatives, February 7, 1931. Mr. JENKINS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed.]

A bill granting pensions to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served during the World War, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the widow of any soldier, sailor, or marine, who entered the service prior to November 11, 1918, and served 90 days or more in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the World War and was honorably discharged therefrom or who having served less than 90 days was discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, such widow having married the soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the passage of this act, shall, upon due proof of her husband's death without proving his death to be the result of his service, be placed upon the pension roll during her widowhood at the rate of \$30 per month: *Provided*, That she has one minor child of the veteran under 16 years of age, or if such widow has two minor children under 16 years of age the rate of pension shall be \$36 per month, or if such widow has three or more minor children under 16 years of age the rate of pension shall be \$42 per month: *Provided further*, That when the minor child or children all attain the age of 16 years, the rate of pension allowed to the widow shall then be reduced to \$20 per month, which will continue to the widow. This section shall apply to a former widow of any soldier, sailor, or marine, who rendered service as hereinbefore described, or who was honorably discharged, or who died in the service due to a disability

or disease incurred in the service in line of duty, such widow having married either once or more after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine, if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage has or have been dissolved, either by the death of the husband or husbands, or by divorce on any ground except adultery on the part of the wife; and any such former widow shall be entitled to and be paid a pension under the conditions set forth above; and in case there be no widow or one not entitled to pension under any law granting additional pension to minor children, then each minor child under 16 years of age of such soldier, sailor, or marine, shall be entitled to a pension of \$10 per month, and in the event of the death or remarriage of the widow or forfeiture of the widow's title to pension, the pension shall continue from the date of such death, remarriage, or forfeiture to such child or children of such soldier, sailor, or marine until the age of 16 years: *Provided further*, That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless the pension shall continue during the life of such child or during the period of such disability.

Sec. 2. That the pension herein provided for shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions, after the approval of this act, and in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

Sec. 3. No claim agent, attorney, or other person engaged in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any original pension claim under the provisions of this act shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive, or retain any fee for such services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting such original pension claim a sum in excess of \$10, which sum shall be payable upon the order of the Commissioner of Pensions under such rules and regulations as he may deem proper to make; and any person who shall, directly or indirectly, otherwise contract for, demand, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under this act, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension allowed or due to such pensioner or claimant under this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense, be fined not exceeding \$500 or be imprisoned not exceeding 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 4. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby modified and amended only so far and as to the extent as herein specifically provided and stated.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The bill which I introduced differed from the pending bill in two respects: My bill did not provide a pension for a widow without children. Neither did it provide a pension to parents. It was simply a bill to provide help to thousands of World War widows who have children and are badly in need of help. Frequently, in the discussion of this bill, the opponents advanced the proposition that these veterans are under the protection of the social-security law. This is not always the case. In order for a veteran to be under social security he must have been employed. Many of the veterans whose families this bill will help died before the social-security law went into effect and many since the social-security law went into effect have not been able to work and consequently were not employed. And besides one of the basic principles of this bill is that there must be dependency. In other words if a man dies and leaves his widow and children well provided for they will not be entitled to any pension under this law. The purpose of this law is to bring relief to the worst cases. Therein lies its real merit. Of course, in its execution no doubt some undeserving persons will be benefited by it but the real cardinal principle of this legislation is to bring relief to needy cases.

I came to Congress a few years after the World War and I have been through practically all of this pension legislation. For years I have maintained that the most deserving group were the unfortunate widows and children who had no means of support. I have spoken at legion conventions and I have never failed to get an almost unanimous response when I put it up to them as to whether they would not prefer a law that would enable their widows to keep their children together than any other pension law. It is an eternal credit to the veteran that in nearly every case the veteran would speak up and say that his most important concern was to feel that his wife and children would be taken care of by the Government so that they would not have to be separated.

I should like to ask your indulgence while I cite you an actual case which profoundly impressed me. About 12 years

ago a World War veteran who had a wife and several children, and for whom I had repeatedly tried to secure a pension and failed, was growing worse and worse and fast approaching his last days. He sent for me to come and see him. As he lived about 100 miles from where I lived I notified him that I would come to see him when I was in his section which would probably be within a week or two, but would come sooner if he insisted. Not having any report I did not go for about 2 weeks, when I received a telephone message asking me if I would come up to see him. I went at once.

When I got there he was waiting for me and was in bad shape. They lived in two rooms which the wife kept clean and tidy. It was in the summertime and after I had visited him a few minutes he asked his wife to retire so that he might talk to me. What he wanted of me was to exact a promise that I would do all I could for his wife and children. He wanted me to do all I could to keep them together. He had been waiting for me so that he could tell me that, and he would then be ready to pass on. I promised him that I would do so. With tears in his eyes he turned his face to the wall and I went out quietly. The next morning he was dead. I firmly believe that by sheer will power he had fought off death until he could get that promise from me. He left his wife and little children absolutely nothing except the knowledge that their husband and their father had served his country well and that in all probability had died as a result of a service-connected disability which we could not prove. From that day to this I have been trying to do for this World War widow and children what I promised him I would do. I have introduced several bills in Congress and have supported every measure of this kind that has come before this Congress. Repeatedly make-shift pieces of legislation have been passed in order to thwart a movement to pass this kind of a bill. I am sure that this bill will pass this House by a tremendous majority. It will probably be as much as 10 to 1. I hope it will pass the Senate and that the President will sign it. I hear rumors that the Senate will not pass it and that the President will not sign it. I hope the Senate does pass it and whether the President signs it or not I am sure there is enough sentiment in the House to pass it over his veto.

Illustrative of the necessity of the enactment of this bill into law, let me give you another incident that has come to my personal knowledge within the last year.

A boy left my home county and served valiantly in France. He was always a nice fellow, though nervous, and when he came home he was in bad shape, but being industrious by nature, he was able to carry on to some extent. A large family of children came to his home. As he grew older his nervousness became more manifest, and although he and I bent every possible energy to secure a service-connected pension for him we were not able to do so. He grew gradually worse from the same trouble which we claimed was service-connected and he finally got to the place where he could not work at anything. He was a total nervous wreck with a bad heart condition. When he became totally disabled we were able to get a total disability pension of \$30 per month. Upon this little pension he and his wife and eight children existed. About a year ago he died. They lived far out in the country. The eldest child, which was 17, was so severely afflicted that it never was able to walk nor talk. This widow was left with this serious task and responsibility of caring for the oldest child and for seven younger ones. Under the pension laws as they are today she would not be entitled to any pension unless we could prove service-connected disability. Every Congressman knows that if a veteran cannot prove service-connected disability while he lives it is a hopeless task for his widow to try and prove it. From that day to this that poor widow has not been able to get any relief of any kind except from charity. You ask me, What about the social-security law? I reply that her husband had become unemployable before the social-security law went into effect and living in the country as he did he would not have been able to find employment. Then you ask me why she would not be protected under the provision of the social-security law which

provides aid to dependent children? There is no question but that she would be entitled to it, but probably some of the Members do not know that there are many cases in the country that this provision of the Social Security Act does not reach. The State of Ohio is probably as forward in the enactment of salutary laws of this kind as any other State in the Union, but the State participation in the dependent children program in Ohio is done by funds, some of which are provided by the State and most of which are provided by the local subdivisions. In Ohio the State has not been as active and as forward in providing funds for the dependent children's program as it has for the old-age pensioners. And some of the local subdivisions in Ohio are so financially upset that they cannot provide very much for this fund. That is the case in the county where I live and where this widow and these eight children live. You probably will ask me then why should not this widow get a portion at least of what is provided?

Then I say to you that it does appear that there should be no reason why she should not have a share at least of what there is provided. But for some reason or another the authorities in Ohio have adopted a rule which I think is unreasonable and unfair to many. I have argued with the proper authorities about it but to no avail. They have a rule the result of which is that those who are first on the list are kept first on the list year after year. Those who fail to get on the list are for that reason left off the list year after year. To illustrate, suppose Mrs. A with two children was first on the list in 1937, although she lived in the city and had a chance to work some, she was provided with an allotment as aid for her dependent children, and this allotment carried through 1938 and 1939. But when Mrs. B, whose husband died in 1939 and who is the widow with the eight children that I have been talking about, applied for aid for her dependent children, she was denied aid because they claim that the fund had all been allocated. Why should not Mrs. A with two children be required to divide with Mrs. B with eight children or why should Mrs. B not get on the list somewhere sometime. It was poor comfort to her and her children that they had to live 10 or 11 months in 1939 without any help. The law providing aid for dependent children did not mean anything to her. And again in 1940 when the new allotment was made Mrs. A went back at the top of the list and Mrs. B with her eight children was left off the list because there was not enough money to reach her.

Now in all fairness where will she go for help. The 17-year-old boy who might have helped her was the most helpless of all of her children. There were no W. P. A. projects of any kind upon which she could work far out in the country and besides she could not leave her children. The township trustees who hand out a few dollars occasionally easily found that their relief funds are very small and easily exhausted.

So to sum it all up this poor widow with her large family of children had no place to go and received no help from any source except what charity and the American Legion and others were able to take to her.

No doubt there are thousands of cases like this in the country. It ought not to be so. Cost what it may they are entitled to be provided for. For years I have favored a pension to the deserving widows of World War veterans and I welcome this chance today to vote for this bill. I hope it may become a law. I will be glad when I can write to dozens of these women who live in my district who have been looking and longing for the time when the Government will do something to help provide for the children of the men who offered their lives for their country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I must rise to oppose any bill favored by the legislative representatives of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am proud of being a member of both organizations and admire the fine patriotic work which they are doing.

In passing I might say that up to this time I have voted for all legislation which has been recommended by the World War Veterans' Committee, but I cannot support this bill.

Every consideration must be given to those who might in any way have suffered from service in the war. I believe that we should lean over backwards in this matter, and that presumption of injury should always be decided in favor of the veteran. But, I cannot see that the Government owes support to dependents of those whose death can in no way be traced to war service, and in regard to which it is impossible in any way to even conceive presumption.

Medical records will show that a majority of those who were called into service and who served only in training camps in this country were aided physically rather than injured by reason of their service.

The principle established by this bill puts these men on a par with those who actually did the fighting.

Now maybe I have a prejudice in favor of combat troops, for I had the privilege of serving abroad with the Second Division. It was our division which had the heaviest casualties of any in the A. E. F. Five thousand one hundred and fifty-five of my comrades were killed in action, or died of wounds; 18,080 were wounded in action. Nothing that we can do is too much for these men and their dependents, and for those who fought alongside them.

The Government has treated them shamefully. It is disgraceful to pay only \$38 a month to the widow of a man killed in action, and we know what small sums are given to those actually wounded in the service.

Let us ask why they are getting, and will get, so little. It will be because of the tremendous sums which will eventually be called for through establishing a principle, such as is in this bill, which will make improbable fair treatment for those who really suffered through their service.

I could not answer to my comrades of the A. E. F. if I supported a bill like this. I could not face the memory of those who made the supreme sacrifice.

Will this bill in any way help their dependents? Could I conceive of their supporting this type of legislation if they were alive? A thousand times no.

What of the countless number wracked in body and soul who bore the brunt of the battle and now lie helpless in our hospitals eking out a miserable pittance from the Government. Will they be helped by the principle which you want to establish? No. They are almost forgotten. Why? Because they have not the votes. But the 2,700,000 who never even left these shores, they have the votes and that is the sole reason for this bill.

Let us once and for all look the facts in the face and be honest about it. Four million seven hundred and ninety-one thousand were mobilized for the war. Of these less than half—approximately 2,000,000—went to France. Can anyone truly say that there is any reason why the United States owes support to the dependents of the 2,700,000 who remained here?

Of those who went to France, approximately 1,000,000 were in the service of supply. These were as patriotic and as fine citizens as the combat troops. They were ready and willing to go to the front if they had been ordered to. But the fact is that they did not receive these orders. The actual number of combat troops in France at the greatest expansion of the A. E. F. was just over a million. But all these even did not see action. Twenty-nine divisions were at one time at the front. Including the replacements, those who saw active service certainly did not number more than 900,000 men, or less than one-fifth of the men mobilized, the dependents of all of whom could receive benefits under this bill.

To those combat troops, every consideration should be given. But why use their fine service as a shield to establish the principle that we should show equal consideration to the nearly 4,000,000 men who saw no action.

This bill in itself does not call for such a large sum in benefits this year, but through it our natural sympathy for

widows and orphans is being used as a cloak for creating an unjustifiable precedent. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that the widows of many veterans who served with him overseas will benefit under the provisions of this act. Does the gentleman know that today there are records of hospitalization in the War Department even for injuries that have never been separated from the files? Many of those who served overseas and who were ill or injured have not been able to establish service connection. Why does the gentleman want to discriminate also between those who served overseas and those who did not? The men in this country did not stay in this country of their own volition, and many of them were terribly ill with the flu. They are being bothered by residuals of that flu today as a result. Many of them were hurt, also some were blind. Some lost both legs. It is very unfair to those men and it is very unfair of the gentleman not to want to help the widows of those who served with him in battle, those whose husbands had not been able to establish service-connected disability and those who have been service connected have been cut time and time again by the Veterans' Administration. It is off again, on again, in compensation, like the W. P. A., in so many veterans' claims. Those veterans' widows will be cared for under this bill to a small degree. I know the gentleman does not mean to be unfair, I am sure he does not fully understand the situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

The gentleman stated in his speech that we put these widows on a par with the widows of men who have a service-connected disability. That is wrong. We do not do that. These widows get a maximum of \$20 a month. The service-connected widow gets \$38 a month and up.

Again I call his attention to the fact that we are not setting any precedent. You have paid pensions to widows of Civil War veterans, who had no service-connected disability, for the last 50 years. You have increased those pensions from time to time and have put women on the roll who married Civil War veterans 40 years after the war closed. Here we are trying to take care of cases that probably owed their disabilities to service in the World War. We are trying to take care of these widows while they have little children to rear, feed, clothe, and educate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH].

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H. R. 9000. I believe this measure is a step in the direction of correcting some of the inequalities which exist under present legislation now on the statute books affecting the widows and orphans of our country's war dead. It seems to me that the opponents of this bill are forgetful of one outstanding fact. They agree that it is proper to award compensation to the widows of the men who were wounded or killed in action on our battle fronts, but they have failed to give any consideration to the widow of the veteran who died at home of a non-service-connected cause. Thus they miss the point that the majority of those who came home, to pass away in the years following, also were actual participants in the war. They fought in battle just as did those who gave their lives in battle; they displayed their patriotism and loyalty just as those who received wounds in battle—and let me remind you, many of them were wounded and their records were lost, and many more suffered wounds but fought bravely on without ever having their wounds marked upon the records. And surely their widows and children are as deserving as the widows and children of the service-connected dead.

I agree, of course, that there is a difference between the service-connected veteran and the non-service-connected veteran with respect to their disabilities, and so there should be

a difference between the rates of pension paid to these cases. However, the widows of service-connected veterans are now receiving \$38 a month if they are under 50 years of age and \$45 a month if they are over 50, with \$8 for one child and \$4 for each additional child. Let me remind you that this bill only provides \$20 a month for the widow of the non-service-connected veteran, regardless of age, and this, I say to you, is unfair, for, although there is a difference between the veterans, I am just as emphatic in stating that there certainly is no difference in their widows. I cannot see why there should be opposition to this measure if we bear in mind that the widow, to receive but \$20 a month, must show need. Back in 1917 these wives were all prepared to make the supreme sacrifice. When their husbands were called to war and did not return, or when they returned and were unable to adjust themselves to changed conditions the wives were the ones who suffered.

We made no distinction then; they were all the same—all willing to sacrifice their husbands, the fathers of their children, and their homes. And they are still the same to me. What if some of their husbands who because of a disability noted on the records can be termed service-connected veterans while others of their husbands who received no such disability or who received it but failed to have it recorded are nonservice connected? Today they are all widows of veterans and I believe that every one of them who can prove their need under the dependency clause in this bill deserves compensation and H. R. 9000 is a step in that direction.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this measure is not a new departure in veterans' legislation. As is customary, the veteran whose dependents will become eligible under the bill must have served honorably for a period of 90 days or more during the World War, or, if less than 90 days, was discharged for disability incurred in the line of duty. The widow without children must have been married to the veteran prior to July 3, 1921, which is the official date of the ending of the World War. A widow with children must have been married to the veteran prior to May 13, 1938; and surely in these troubled times no one can deny that such a widow of a veteran should have the financial assistance this bill provides. The money paid to these needy persons will, at least, do a small part in alleviating conditions that cause relief, and it will add that much more purchasing power in the communities where it is received.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERLACH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New Jersey spoke about his comrades who went overseas. As a matter of fact, a large number of service-connected cases never went overseas, and in the cases of a great number of the men who did go overseas and who came back and broke down after 1925 with tuberculosis or neuropathic trouble or other chronic constitutional diseases and died, their widows and orphans get nothing, although if the truth were known they would be just as much entitled to it as the dependents of men who have been on the roll all these years. For this reason, we are trying to take care of the widows and orphans of these men in this bill.

Mr. KEAN. I would say to the gentleman that certainly a service-connected case in this country is absolutely entitled to consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but there were a great many cases of men who really did have a service-connected disability but who did not prove it and did not try to prove it because they thought they could overcome it, and then after the time had expired they attempted to do so and found they were too late. Then when they went down to their graves their widows and orphans were shut out. This bill will take care of them.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

This same class of dependents of the veterans of both the Spanish-American War and the Civil War were granted compensation, each approximately 20 years after those wars. Surely the widows and children of the veterans of the World War should have the same consideration. Yet the provi-

sions of H. R. 9000 are more restrictive than similar legislation applicable to the widows and children of these prior wars in that this bill places a limitation that any widow without child with an annual income over \$1,000, or widow with children with an annual income over \$2,500 would not benefit. These widows are required to prove dependency under regulations prescribed by the Veterans' Administration. Existing law does not require the widows of the Spanish-American and Civil War veterans to show such dependency.

Let us think, then, in terms of comparison with the widows and children of the veterans of these earlier wars, and I believe we will realize that we should not attempt to deprive these needy widows from this just compensation. It has been stated on the floor of the House, in opposition to this measure, that we should not slam the door in the face of the widows and children whose men gave their lives in battle. I do not think we have ever slammed the door in the face of such widows and children, nor in the face of the widows and children of the veterans of other wars. Why should we, then, slam the door in the face of this group who deserve compensation? We have, I say to you, for over 20 years been slamming the door in their faces despite the fact that they are widows and children of men who served our country just as faithfully as those killed in action, who fought just as meritoriously but who lived to die, if the truth and the records were known, in a large percentage of disease or disability received during the service they rendered. Let us be fair to this deserving group, for their cause is just as worthy. Let us remember that at the call-to-arms these wives were all the same, all willing to sacrifice their most treasured possessions; all willing to do their bit for our great country; and though some of their husbands died on the fields of France while other of their husbands returned to take up life where they left it when they went "over there"; today, as widows of veterans, they deserve the same consideration.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues on both sides of the House to vote for H. R. 9000. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, we have before us once again just another piece of veterans' legislation. Periodically in each session of the Congress we are confronted with numerous bills of this character to provide additional benefits for veterans of the World War. We are always told that we are doing for the World War veterans what we have done for the veterans of previous wars, that we are not setting a new precedent, that we are merely following a precedent, yet when the charge is made against this bill that it is opening the door to universal pensions we are told that no such step is even contemplated.

The precedent for universal pensions has been set in the case of the Spanish War veterans, and the same argument of following precedents will be used when they bring in that bill, and the bill is now pending before the Congress. It is true the committee may not have held hearings on it and may not have reported it out, but the disability-pension bill of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is now pending before the Congress. While that bill, according to their figures but not the Veterans' Administration figures, would cost, if it were to be passed, \$293,000,000 annually the first year, they list the item for pensions at age 65, paying \$60 a month, as costing only approximately \$14,000,000 the first year. Figures have definitely been presented to show that this item alone will cost this country \$20,000,000,000 if you ever enact it into law. This is the first step to make that provision eligible to enactment into law.

We are told that these people are now on relief and that this bill is going to take them off relief. We have heard many tears splash upon the floor of this well for those poor widows and orphans who are on relief and should not be there. I wonder if they will be grateful to you for taking them off relief, where they may be earning \$40 or \$60 a month, and handing them \$20 a month as a pension instead.

The amount you are offering is a mere pittance. It is not an adequate pension for one who is entitled to a pension; but because you are including this vast army of dependents of

4,700,000 veterans, because you are making all of them eligible, you cannot afford to pay a decent amount to them, nor can you afford to increase the compensation that is due those who are actually disabled because they suffered a service-connected disability.

The gentleman from Mississippi very definitely emphasizes the fact that they are not setting precedents, and he says we cannot increase the pension of the disabled because to do so would create a dangerous condition; that someone would come along in a later Congress and strike out the service-connected requirement. What are you doing in this bill if you are not striking out the service-connected requirement? The very thing the gentleman complains of, in not wanting to increase the pensions of those who are justly entitled to pensions, is that in some later Congress they might do the thing you are doing now in this bill, namely, eliminating the requirement to show service connection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We increased them last year, and my recollection is that the vote was 359 to 1.

Mr. COSTELLO. I will state to the gentleman that he is quite correct. I objected to that particular bill because of two sections that were contained in it. Under the situation in which the bill was brought up it was not possible to offer an amendment on this floor. The bill went over to the Senate, and before the Senate committee the Veterans' Administration raised their protest against those two sections. The Senate struck out the very two sections that I demanded should be stricken from the bill. The Senate passed the bill that way, and the bill came right back to the floor of this House. The gentleman from Mississippi himself did not even ask that this House disagree to the Senate amendments. By unanimous consent the House agreed to the Senate amendments. The House reversed its position and stood by me, not with the original bill. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. The reason we did not insist on those amendments was that it was at the very end of the session and we knew it would kill the bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. It was not my intention to kill it. The provisions in that bill were put in there solely for the purpose of upsetting the established basis on which the Veterans' Administration had been operating.

Mr. RANKIN. That was the bill in which we increased the compensation of the widows and orphans of service-connected disabled veterans.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may say to the gentleman I had no objection to those provisions of the bill, it was the new precedent you were establishing by sections 4 and 7 of that bill, I believe, to which I raised my objection. The new precedent established in this bill by bringing in parents is one of the items to which I am opposed in this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] being unable to secure additional time, I am going to answer the remark of the chairman of the committee and point out to the chairman of the committee that the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] has a bill before your committee now to pay \$60 a month to the widows of men who died in service and I would be happy to vote for that bill when the committee sees fit to bring it out.

I regret the necessity of opposing H. R. 9000. There is no Member of this House who holds the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars in higher regard than I do, but it will be a sorry day for those two organizations and for the Members of this House when members of that organization cannot agree on the merits of legislation that they introduce here.

I consider this bill ill-advised, ill-considered, and extremely ill-timed. I cannot vote for this general pension bill when I know that at this present moment we are not adequately providing for the widows of men who died in battle or for their dependents and when we are not providing for the

widows of men in the active establishment. I have a letter in my files from the widow of a young officer who gave his life in the crash of the *Shenandoah*. She is receiving today a paltry pension of \$22 a month, and we propose to give \$20 a month to the widow of a veteran under this measure where the widow was not born at the time of the war and the veteran served on a college campus during the war.

I was called out to the door during this debate by a Gold Star Mother who greeted me with tears in her eyes and said, "I hope you defeat this bill, if only you can do something for us Gold Star Mothers who are living in a garret on \$45 a month." As a veteran I cannot support this legislation while that situation exists, and I may say to the members of this Committee that you are not going to take any widows of World War veterans off of W. P. A.—not by their choice anyway. Let us assume that two widows come before you, as an employment manager, either in private industry or in W. P. A. One widow has a pension of a paltry \$20 a month from the Federal Government and the other widow has no income. Which one are you going to hire, whether it be in W. P. A. or private industry? If we pass H. R. 9000 we are going to harm the very group that the proponents of this legislation sincerely desire to assist, and I say to you that the amount of money involved in this bill is not the most vital factor. If it were right and cost \$100,000,000 a year, I would vote for it; but it is not right and it is not sound, and we are not in a position to pay it.

I want to say a word or two about the action of the American Legion on this legislation. I cannot speak for the American Legion. I speak only for myself and for my constituents. The American Legion adopted this proposal as the fourth point in a 4-point program in 1934, and no national convention of the American Legion has considered the contents of this bill or the provisions of this bill in any detail since that time. The Legion has simply asked, in 1934, for protection of the widows and orphans of World War veterans. No convention has endorsed the provision of this bill, but each year has said, "We reiterate our previous stand on widows' and orphans' legislation," and never in a national convention of the American Legion have they endorsed any provision of law that would provide a pension for any veteran or his dependents, regardless of whether there was any service-connected disability.

Congress established the precedent in the disability-allowance law. The American Legion never asked, and neither had any other veteran organization ever asked, for the disability-allowance law to pay a pension to a veteran for disabilities not incurred in service. That law was passed by the Congress in an election year, and the *Record* shows that the most generous provisions of our veterans' laws were passed in election years, and the veterans themselves are wise to that situation.

I have had many letters in opposition to this bill from veterans and some from business institutions, but I had one that really impressed me greatly from a veteran who lived in what we colloquially call a flophouse, the Citadel Hotel, of Hartford, operated by the Salvation Army, with room and breakfast for 25 cents. He made the strongest argument against this bill, and that man today is not on any roll. I made every effort to get him on W. P. A., but he is frank enough to say that such legislation as this will discredit the veterans of the World War. I went back to my district and talked to several posts of the American Legion and to a district meeting and explained this bill to them, and they are not for it. But if you say to a veteran or a Legionnaire, "Are you in favor of legislation for widows and orphans of World War veterans," of course they will say, "Sure, I am," because they assume that you are referring to widows of men who gave their lives or were disabled in the service. When you say that this bill will open the gates wide then they are opposed to it.

I wish there were time to go into other details of this bill. Two of them can be approached by amendment. [Applause.]

For example, I feel very strongly that the marriage provision which would qualify a widow married to a veteran prior to July 3, 1921, is much too liberal, and should be restricted to

those widows whose marriage occurred prior to the signing of the armistice. In this way we would be providing at least for widows who shared the difficulties and inconveniences of the war years. We would not be opening up the pension rolls to persons who had no connection whatsoever with the veteran during his period of service.

I would also like to offer an amendment striking out the provisions which would care for dependent parents. Never before in the history of veterans' legislation have such provisions been included in pension legislation, and I feel that at such a time as this, when our financial structure is subjected to tremendous strain and when the defense program of this Nation is of paramount importance, any further extension of pension protection should not be countenanced.

With respect to the third amendment which I should like to offer, I refer to the injustice which might arise from dual coverage of persons coming under the provisions of this act. Many of the widows of veterans covered by this act are also eligible for social-security benefits. In many instances these benefits will exceed those which they would receive under the provisions of H. R. 9000. I think it only fair to the average American who is eligible for social-security benefits, but who is not entitled to veterans' pensions, that some arrangement be made whereby these persons may be entitled only to one of these benefits. In order to be absolutely fair, I think that such benefits should be judged on the basis of amount and for that reason I shall offer an amendment to the effect that where dual coverage occurs the person in question shall be entitled only to the greater benefit.

As I said at the outset, this legislation is ill-advised, ill-considered, and extremely ill-timed. We have provided pensions for our veterans in the past on the basis of actual service, and I think no one begrudges one penny of the money which has been spent in order to make comfortable those veterans who sacrificed life or limb for this country. But I can see no justification for penalizing the already overburdened taxpayer for the benefit of the families of men whose war service was done in a training camp, thousands of miles from any conflict, and whose training actually benefited rather than harmed them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill is very timely, and I am going to support it with all the energy at my command. I have studied veterans legislation, as I have studied the question of war and peace ever since I came out of that conflict in 1918, from whence arises this problem we are discussing, and I am free to say that there is nothing within the power of the people of the United States that they can give either to the veterans of the World War or to their widows and orphans that is today good enough for them, or that will ever repay the debt of gratitude the United States owes to them, whether they lost their lives, or were wounded, or did not get to the front. The mere fact that they offered their lives should be sufficient justification for the passage of this legislation. There is nothing wrong with this bill except that it does not go far enough. I think we should take care of these people in a still greater way than we are aiming to do in this bill. I think we should take care of the people who have been discussed here by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] and some of the others who have made the point that we should take care of the dependents of those who lost their lives in battle. I agree with them, but I also submit that we have not done enough for them or for their widows and orphans. I have in my own district two cases which are directly in point in that respect, one of them the case of the widow of Capt. George H. Mallon, one of Pershing's hundred heroes of the World War, and a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor, who is now receiving the munificent sum of approximately \$30 a month, although Captain Mallon was a high-caliber man, who in his lifetime provided well for his family, as his earnings never ran less than two or three hundred dollars a month; and now to ask a widow and her chil-

dren since his death August 2, 1934, to live on approximately \$30 a month is beyond all comprehension.

I have another case in my district in Minnesota, a very pitiful case, where a mother named Mrs. Hanna Johnstad gave two sons on the field of battle, Elmer M. and Albert P., and today she is receiving the pitiful sum of \$40 a month. I call attention to the fact that in Minnesota we pay \$20.71 a month to old-age pension recipients, or 71 cents a month more than Mrs. Johnstad is receiving from each after having given her two sons to the cause of her country in 1917 and 1918. So I say there are many things that we should do if we really want to show our gratitude, and if we want to show a real sense of justice to these people whom we are discussing here today.

The point is frequently made that we owe nothing to non-service-connected cases. I tell you that no man can be taken from his usual environment, from his usual vocation, and placed in an army camp as were 4,000,000 of our young men in 1917 and 1918, and come out of that experience, whether he went up to the front or not, without having suffered mentally and physically. I know in my own experience where as a young man I was placed in a camp under a captain who had been training a group of illiterate colored boys in Mississippi. You can imagine just how we Minnesota boys felt to be treated as this captain attempted to treat us, after having been transferred to our camp with the type of training which he had been giving to those poor illiterate colored boys.

I suffered and I know all of my comrades from Minnesota suffered from his ruthless, arbitrary, dictatorial attitude and his overbearing and inconsiderate manner, as did the comrades from other States that were placed under the conditions which we experienced. We suffered, too, as to food, which was musty, filthy, and inadequate either qualitatively or quantitatively. We suffered physically and mentally day and night. One morning I awoke and found that during the night, because of the high altitude in the camp where we were, the snow had started falling, and the wind had begun to blow like a hurricane, and it had blown a drift through our tent and entirely covered my cot, and when I attempted to rise in the morning, chilled through and shivering, both shoes were drifted full of a mixture of sand and snow. I had to get up, throw that snow off my blankets, and try to get my feet into those wet shoes, lace them up with frozen fingers, and then enjoy the day's activities, rotten food, slave-driving, and all, as we were preparing to go to the front. Ten percent of our group died of mistreatment and exposure before we ever got started to the front, and most of the others felt those 10 percent were lucky.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is that information in your service record today?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; of course not.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Then you could not prove it, if you became disabled today, that it had any effect upon your physical make-up?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No. On the occasion described I had just recovered from an attack of the "flu," from which I had been sick for a week, and with the type of food we were getting, and got even during that hospitalization and afterward, that sort of atmosphere and environment could not help but have an effect; so that when I returned home from my service I immediately came down with inflammatory rheumatism simply as a result of the severe exposure incurred in service.

None of this shows on my record. I am not complaining because I had the will power and determination to rise above that sort of thing, although doctors said then I could never get well; but to the man who might have a less strong mind, I can see that there is much injustice being practiced in the United States today when we do not take care of these non-service-connected cases, and when we do not take care of their widows and orphans as provided to a small degree in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, were not a great many of those service records lost, especially overseas?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is true. I have received several cases from men in my district, in fact one this morning, trying to find men who can help him with his affidavits, to get justice, which he has been trying to get during all these years.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman spoke about a Gold Star Mother in his district who was getting \$40 a month. She is entitled to at least \$45 under the bill we passed here last year.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The letter I have from her is dated January 6. She evidently was not receiving the increase at that time; but I will see that the matter is taken up with the Veterans' Administration, and I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

Now, the point has been made that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars do not know what they are doing in this matter. I want to make the suggestion that they and their members are the very ones who do know what they are doing, because they have had experience, because they have been in close contact with these comrades and with their wives and orphans, and know what the problem is better than anyone else.

For my part, I can say I have had requests from every Legion post and from every Veterans of Foreign Wars post in my district asking me to support this bill. I am glad that my comrades back home are alive to the need for this meritorious legislation. The mere fact that the death rate among the veterans who are still alive is much higher than it is among other people who did not serve is proof in itself that something happened to those men when they were in the service, even though they did not get up to the front. They were the best, physically speaking, in the Nation 23 years ago. Why this excessive death rate?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows, of course, that 91 World War veterans are dying every 24 hours?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; and that proportion of deaths is much higher proportionally than among the rest of the population.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Is not the gentleman aware of the fact that, according to official War Department records, 81 percent of the men discharged who were not actually wounded were in better physical condition than the day they enlisted?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not agree with that statement. I think it is very far from true.

Mr. MILLER. It is official.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not think they know what they were talking about. In fact, they did not know I was sick when they let me out, and I just managed to get home before a complete break-down of long duration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another point I want to make in this connection in the limited time I have at my disposal, and that is that if the forces of greed and selfishness continue to lead us along on the road to war, as they are doing in unmistakable fashion at the present time—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, to ask him a question.

Is it not a fact that the average World War veteran who served any appreciable time was wrung loose from his purpose in life, and many of them never did get back into the harness?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Most of them have not been able to rehabilitate or reinstate themselves to this day as they were at the time when they went into the service. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech which I gave in the House on November 2, 1939, entitled, "After the War, Peace," which is the point I was about to make.

The CHAIRMAN. That being extraneous matter, the gentleman must obtain that permission in the House.

Mr. ALEXANDER. As I started to say when interrupted, if the forces of selfishness and greed continue to lead us into war, then we should let them know by passing this bill that they are going to have to pay the costs, such as these pensions, out of their war profits. And I, for my part, shall be pleased to make the costs just as high as possible. We did not ask for war, we will not ask for embroilment in the present one, but the millions who went in 1917 and 1918 and their dependents paid and are paying with lives and fiber and blood and health, for none of which filthy lucre can ever replace or repay, so let those leading the Nation in again have their answer plain and clear here today.

There are two more things we should do as a corollary to the passage of this bill, and that is, first, tax and take every dollar of profit which will be made as a result of the present war, and set it aside as a fund to take care of the future needs of the wounded, disabled, and disheartened, the flot-sam of what the next few years may have in store for us, and their parents, their widows, and orphans. Second, after those have been provided for, we should also take constructive steps now to prevent any future reoccurrence of such a catastrophe as that approaching us. We can prevent this eternal and periodical recurrence of war if we want to the same as we have done in this Nation for 152 years with but one exception. For nearly 75 years we were at peace, and now since 1865 we have another 75 years of peace. We can do the same for the world if we want to and thus save ourselves. I have reference to the plan presented in my address of November 2, 1939, entitled, "After the War, Peace," in which I offer a suggestion for a United States of the World. I commend it to the consideration of everyone in this Nation, and then from us to the sad and war-torn world. It is the only "road to peace." Let us grasp it.

AFTER THE WAR, PEACE!

[Remarks of Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER, of Minnesota, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, November 2, 1939]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, 181 against 243 for is the sad record of the roll-call vote this afternoon, November 2, 1939, in the House of Representatives on the question of repeal of the embargo against the sale of arms and munitions of war. My heart sinks when I realize the meaning of such a vote. I was never so forlorn or so filled with despair as I am tonight as I approach the thankless task of trying to pick up the wreckage after the storm, to use a descriptive phrase with which we are all familiar.

I know of no better time, however, than right now to start to build on the broken pedestal of hope for a real peace after the war which we cannot escape, I fear, after the action of the House today.

In a great majority of the hundreds of speeches I have made on many and varied occasions in the past 12 years I have stated that there is a way to a real and lasting peace, a way as yet untried, a way open to us after all else—all human experimentation—has failed—a sure way, because it is the way appointed by the Creator of mankind.

I suggested it in my address in the House on February 22, last, entitled "Is Democracy in Guam?"; again on May 9, in my The Only Road to Peace; also in my neutrality address of June 28, and again yesterday, when I suggested in my remarks before the House that we should, as a corollary to our vote here today, demand the right to write the terms of the next treaty of peace when this war has finally burned itself out after years of destruction.

The future welfare of this Nation and of humanity in general greatly depends on how well we write that peace treaty, consequently, I want to cut the pattern for it now, to set out a formula. I want to have it ready for the great minds—if any be left then—who will sit around the peace table in that day and year after travail and shedding of blood have wrought the reform we need, and have burned the word "honesty" into our hearts and souls, which the oratory of the Congress could not do this year, even though supported by the voices and letters of thousands of our citizens begging us not to traffic in war materials.

WE GO TO WAR

Religious, racial, political, economic, and patriotic prejudices destroy peace and the edifice of humanity. As long as these prejudices prevail, humanity will not ever have rest. How can we best remove them? How? Did you ever ask yourself that question? If so, and if you found the answer, you are to be highly congratulated for you are one of God's noblemen.

For a period of 6,000 years history informs us about this world of ours. During these 6,000 years we have not been free from war, strife, murder, and bloodthirstiness. In every period war has been waged in one country or another, and that war was due to business

competition fought under a cloak of either religious prejudice, racial prejudice, political prejudice, or patriotic prejudice. Consequently, the answer to the problem must be found in the removal of these prejudices as all are destructive of the human edifice. As long as these prejudices persist, the struggle for existence must remain dominant, and bloodthirstiness and rapacity continue.

Therefore, today, in this twentieth century, even as was the case in the past, the world of humanity cannot be saved from the darkness of nature and economic rivalry, and cannot attain illumination except through the abandonment of prejudices and by the acquisition of the morals of the kingdom as enunciated by Jesus Christ over 1,900 years ago. Consider if there is prejudice and enmity on account of religion. Religion should be the cause of fellowship, otherwise it is fruitless. And if this prejudice is the prejudice of nationality, all mankind are of one nation; all have sprung from the tree of Adam. That tree is one and all these nations are only the branches, while the individuals of humanity are like leaves, blossoms, and fruits of the branches. Therefore, it is ignorance and selfishness which sets one nation up against another in war.

As to the patriotic prejudice, this is also due to absolute ignorance, for the surface of the earth is everyone's native land. Everyone can live in any spot on this globe. All the world is man's birthplace. These boundaries, and the red and blue lines on the maps, are devised by selfish man. In the creation, such boundaries were not assigned. Europe is one continent; Asia is one continent; America, Africa, Australia are each one continent; but some, from personal motives and selfish interests, have divided each one of these continents and considered a certain part as their own country.

NO FRONTIER

God has set up no frontier between France and Germany; they are continuous; yet selfish souls for the promotion of their own interests fight over these imaginary lines on the maps. And this situation will continue indefinitely, if this conception of patriotism remains limited within a certain circle, and it will be a primary cause of the world's destruction. No, my friends, the terrestrial globe is the motherland of us all and not any restricted area, for is not man the son of God and is not God also the creator of the earth—therefore the property of each individual by right of inheritance. In fact, it is not only ours to live on, but it is also in death our eternal tomb. Is it worth while that we should engage in bloodshed and stage war after war as we are now and always have, over this eternal tomb?

SIGNS OF IMPENDING CHAOS

Not only have we widespread war in progress but never, indeed, have there been such widespread and basic upheavals, whether in the social, economic, or political spheres of human activity as are now going on all over the world. Never have there been so many and varied sources of danger as those that now threaten the structure of society. How long will humanity persist in its waywardness? How long will injustice continue? How long is chaos and confusion to reign among men? How long will discord agitate the face of society? The signs of impending chaos and convulsions can now be discerned, inasmuch as the prevailing order appears to be lamentably defective.

The disquieting influence of over 30,000,000 souls in minorities living under precarious conditions in Europe; the vast and ever-swelling army of the unemployed here, with its crushing burden and demoralizing influence on governments and peoples; the wicked, unbridled race of armaments swallowing an ever-increasing share of the substance of already impoverished nations; the utter demoralization of the international financial markets; the onslaught of secularism invading what has hitherto been regarded as the impregnable strongholds of Christian orthodoxy—these stand out as some of the grave symptoms that bode ill for the future stability of the structure of modern civilization. Little wonder that one of Europe's preeminent thinkers, honored for his wisdom and restraint, should have been forced to make so bold an assertion: "The world is passing through the gravest crisis in the history of civilization." "We stand," writes another, "before either a world catastrophe or, perhaps, before the dawn of a greater era of truth and wisdom." It is in such times that religions have perished and are born.

Might we not already discern, as we scan the political horizon, the alignment of those forces that are dividing afresh the Continent of Europe into two camps of combatants, determined upon a contest that may mark, unlike the last war, the end of an epoch, a vast epoch, in the history of human evolution?

Are we, the privileged custodians of a priceless faith and a great principle of government, called upon to witness a cataclysmical change, politically as fundamental and spiritually as beneficent as that which precipitated the fall of the Roman Empire in the west? Might it not happen, perhaps, that out of this world eruption there may stream forces of such spiritual energy as shall recall, nay eclipse, the splendor of those signs and wonders that accompanied the establishment of the faith of Christianity? Might there not emerge out of the agony of a shaken world a religious revival of such scope and power as to even transcend the potency of those world-directing forces with which the religions of the past have, at fixed intervals and according to an inscrutable wisdom, revived the fortunes of declining ages and peoples? Might not the bankruptcy of this present, this highly vaunted materialistic civilization, in itself clear away the choking weeds that now hinder the unfoldment and perfection of God's struggling faith?

GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF A NEW WORLD ORDER

Shall we strive to attempt or venture to obtain a glimpse of the first streaks of the promised dawn that must, in the fullness of time, chase away the gloom that has encircled humanity? Let me point out in broad outline what appears to be the guiding principles underlying a new world order.

That the unrest and suffering afflicting the mass of mankind are in no small measure the direct consequences of the World War and attributable to the unwisdom and shortsightedness of the framers of the peace treaties only a biased mind can refuse to admit. It would be idle, however, to contend that the war, with all the losses it involved, the passions it aroused, and the grievances it left behind, has solely been responsible for the unprecedented confusion into which almost every section of the civilized world is plunged at present.

Is it not a fact—and this is one of the ideas I desire to bring out—that the fundamental cause of this world unrest is attributable, not so much to the consequences of what must sooner or later come to be regarded as a transitory dislocation in the affairs of a continually changing world, but rather to the failure of those into whose hands the immediate destinies of peoples and nations have been committed, to adjust their system of religious, economic, and political institutions to the imperative needs of a rapidly evolving age? Are not these intermittent crises that convulse present-day society due primarily to the lamentable inability of the world's recognized leaders and preachers to read aright the signs of the times, to rid themselves of their preconceived ideas and fettering creeds, and to reshape the machinery of their respective governments or positions according to a new standard—the standard that is implicit in the declaration of the oneness of mankind, the chief and distinguishing feature of the faith Christ proclaimed? Consider that question carefully and see if your answer is not the same as mine. Do you not recall that in every dispensation the light of divine guidance has been focused on one central theme? In this glorious century of ours the foundation of the faith of God and the distinguishing feature of His law are the evidences and the consciousness of the oneness of mankind.

How pathetic indeed are the efforts of all those leaders of human institutions who, in utter disregard of the spirit of the age, are striving to adjust national processes, suitable to the ancient days of self-contained nations, to an age which must either achieve the unity of the world or perish. At so critical an hour in the history of the world, great and small, whether in the east or in the west, whether victors or vanquished, whether aggressors or peacemakers, all must give heed to this clarion call and arise manfully to carry out in its entirety the one remedial scheme He, the Divine Physician, has prescribed for an ailing humanity. Let them discard, once for all, every preconceived idea, every national prejudice or human subterfuge, and give heed to this sublime counsel.

WE NEED A UNITED STATES OF THE WORLD

Here in America, I am convinced, we can best serve our country by striving in our capacity as a citizen to assist in the eventual application of the principle of federalism underlying our own Government, to the relationships now existing between all the peoples and nations of the world, so that we may have a united states of the world.

Such an ideal requires great leadership. True civilization will unfurl its banner in the midst of the heart of the world whenever a certain number of its distinguished and high-minded leaders—the shining exemplars of devotion and determination—shall, for the good and happiness of all mankind, arise with firm resolve and clear vision to establish in this way the cause of real and universal peace—universal peace, and not the fake, nationalistic peace most of us have been pursuing without satisfactory results. The cause of peace must be made the object of general consultation, built on a union of the nations and peoples of the world. We must conclude a binding treaty and establish a covenant, the provisions of which shall be sound, inviolable, and definite. It must be proclaimed to all the world and obtain the sanction of all the human race. This supreme and noble undertaking—the real source of the peace and well-being of all the world—should be regarded as sacred by all that dwell on earth. All the forces of humanity must be mobilized to insure the stability and permanence of this great covenant, the world's great need. In such an all-embracing pact the rights and limitations of each and every people and nation should be clearly fixed, the principles underlying the relations of governments toward one another definitely laid down, and all international agreements and obligations ascertained and determined.

In like manner the size of the armaments of every government should be strictly limited, for if the preparations for war and the military forces of any nation should be allowed to increase they will arouse the suspicion of others. The fundamental principle underlying this solemn pact should be so fixed that if any government later violates any one of its provisions all the governments on earth should rise to reduce it to utter submission; nay, the human race as a whole should resolve, with every power at its disposal, to destroy that government. Should this greatest of all remedies be applied to the sick body of the world it will recover from its ills and will remain safe from war, without the least bit of doubt.

INDOMITABLE DETERMINATION REQUIRED

Some timid souls, unaware of the power latent in human endeavor, consider this suggestion as highly impracticable; nay, even

beyond the scope of man's utmost efforts. Such is not the case, however. On the contrary, thanks to the unfailing grace of God, the loving kindness of His favored ones, and the unrivaled endeavors of wise and capable souls, nothing whatsoever can be regarded as unattainable. Endeavor, ceaseless endeavor, is required. Nothing short of an indomitable determination can possibly achieve it. Many a cause which past ages have regarded as purely visionary now in this day has become an accomplished fact. Why should this most great and lofty cause—the cornerstone of true civilization, of the advancement, the well-being, and the success of all humanity—be regarded as impossible of achievement?

THE LIGHTS OF UNITY

In cycles gone by, though harmony was established, yet, owing to the absence of means, the unity of all mankind could not have been achieved. Continents remained widely divided, so that, even among the peoples of one and the same continent, association and interchange of thought were well-nigh impossible. Consequently, understanding and unity amongst all the peoples and kindreds of the earth were unattainable.

In this day, however, means of communication have multiplied, and the five continents of the earth have virtually merged into one. In like manner all the members of the human family, whether peoples or governments, cities or villages, have become increasingly interdependent. For none is self-sufficiency any longer possible or desirable, inasmuch as political ties unite all peoples and nations, and the bonds of trade and industry, of agriculture and education are being strengthened every day. Time and space have virtually been eliminated as elements in world conditions. Hence the unity of all mankind can in this day be achieved. Actually this is none other but one of the wonders of this wondrous age, this glorious century. Of this, past ages have been deprived. This century—the century of light—has been endowed with the miraculous unfolding of a fresh marvel every day, but none greater than that which I have just described, because it makes possible the true road to peace.

As foundation stones of that accomplishment there are seven elements of unity which will needs accompany it, if its benefits are to be permanently enjoyed. The first is unity in the political realm, early glimmerings of which have been discernible for some time. The second element is unity of thought in world undertakings, such as crime curing, temperance, and disease controls. The third is unity in freedom. The fourth is unity in religion. The fifth is the unity of nations, causing all the peoples of the world to regard themselves as citizens of one common government. The sixth is unity of races, and the seventh element is unity of language. Each and every one of these will inevitably come to pass inasmuch as the power of the Kingdom of God has, is, and will assist in their realization.

"But," I hear someone say, "there will be opposition." Yes; there is and will be, and yet are we not justified in deriving fresh encouragement when we observe that the very consideration of such proposals is in itself an evidence of their steady growth in the minds and hearts of men? In the organized attempts that are made to discredit so exalted a conception, are we not witnessing the repetition, on a large scale, of those stirring struggles and fierce controversies that preceded the birth, and assisted in the reconstruction of, our own present unified action in this country?

THE FEDERATION OF MANKIND

To pursue this illustration further, how confident were the assertions made in the days preceding the unification of the States of the North American Continent regarding the insuperable barriers that stood in the way of their ultimate federation. Was it not widely and emphatically declared that the conflicting interests, the mutual distrust, the differences of government and habit that divided the States were such as no force, whether spiritual or temporal, could ever hope to harmonize or control?

And yet how different were the conditions prevailing a hundred and fifty years ago from those that characterize present-day society! It would indeed be no exaggeration to say that the absence of those facilities which modern scientific progress has placed at the service of humanity in our time made of the problem of welding the American States into a single federation, a task infinitely more complex than that which confronts a divided humanity in its efforts to achieve the unification of all mankind into a United States of the World.

Upon the consummation of this colossal and glorious enterprise will depend the fulfillment of the prophecies uttered by the prophets of old when swords shall be beaten into plowshares and the lion and the lamb lie down together. It alone can usher in the kingdom of the Heavenly Father as anticipated by the faith and by the prayer of Jesus Christ, whose main point in His philosophy proclaimed the oneness of mankind. Surely the world, contracted and transformed into a single highly complex organism by the marvelous progress achieved in the realm of physical science, by the world-wide expansion of commerce and industry, and struggling, under the pressure of world economic forces, amidst the pitfalls of a materialistic civilization, stands in dire need of a restatement of the truth of that philosophy.

Into such a period and condition, overshadowed by such moral and social gloom, we are now steadily and irresistibly moving whether we will it so or not. Amidst the shadows which are increasingly gathering about us we can faintly discern the glimmerings appearing fitfully on the horizon of history. To us, the generation of the half light, living at a time which may be designated as the period of the incubation of the world commonwealth, has been assigned a task whose high privilege we can never sufficiently appre-

ciate and the arduousness of which we can as yet but dimly recognize. We may as well believe, we who are called upon to experience the operation of the dark forces destined to unloose a flood of agonizing afflictions, that the darkest hour that must precede the dawn of the golden age of our faith has about struck.

UNIVERSAL FERMENT

If we view the world carefully, we cannot miss the clear evidence of that universal fermentation which, in every continent and in every department of human life, be it religious, social, economic, or political, is purging and reshaping humanity in anticipation of the day when the wholeness of the human race will have been recognized and its unity established.

A twofold process, however, can be distinguished, each tending in its own way and with an accelerated momentum to bring to a climax the forces that are transforming the face of our planet. The first is essentially an integrating process, while the second is fundamentally disruptive. The former, as it steadily evolves, unfolds a system which may well serve as a pattern for that world polity toward which a strangely disordered world is continually advancing, while the latter, as its disintegrating influence deepens, tends to tear down, with increasing violence, the antiquated barriers that seek to block humanity's progress toward its destined goal. The constructive process stands associated with the faith of Jesus and is the harbinger of the new order which that faith must ere long establish. The destructive forces that characterize the other should be identified with a secular civilization that has refused to answer to the expectation of this new age and is consequently falling into chaos and decline.

A titanic struggle, unparalleled in its magnitude, yet unspeakably glorious in its final consequences, is being waged as a result of these very opposing tendencies. The hollow and outworn institutions, the obsolescent doctrines and beliefs, the effete and discredited traditions which these forces represent, have, in certain instances, been undermined by virtue of their senility, the loss of their cohesive power, and their own inherent corruption. The perversion of human nature, the degradation of human conduct, the corruption and dissolution of human institutions, reveal themselves, under such circumstances, in their worst and most revolting aspects. Human character is debased, confidence is shaken, the nerves of discipline are relaxed, the voice of human conscience is stilled, the sense of decency and shame is obscured, conception of duty in both high and low places, of solidarity, of reciprocity, and loyalty are distorted, and the very feeling of peacefulness, of joy, and of hope is gradually extinguished.

ELEMENTS OF A DECADENT SOCIETY

The reappearance of religious intolerance, of racial animosity, and of patriotic arrogance; the increasing evidences of selfishness, of suspicion, of fear, and of fraud; the spread of terrorism, of lawlessness, of drunkenness, and of crime; the unquenchable thirst for, and the feverish pursuit after, earthly vanities, riches, and pleasures; the weakening of family solidarity; the laxity in parental control; the lapse into luxurious indulgence; the degeneracy of art and music, the infection of literature, and the corruption of our press; the extension of the influence and activities of those "prophets of decadence" who refuse to regard the procreation of children as the sacred and primary purpose of marriage, who denounce religion as an opiate of the people, who would, if given free rein, lead back the human race to barbarism, chaos, and ultimate extinction—all these appear as the outstanding characteristics of a decadent society, a society that must be either reborn, or perish.

With this situation, compare and consider the character and philosophy of Christ. Instead of the recrudescence just described, He pushed every good trait of human character and condition of life to its utmost limit of perfection. His forgiveness was unbounded, His generosity was untiring, His patience was inexhaustible, His mercy was immeasurable, His courage was illimitable. His wisdom was unfathomable, His kindness was interminable, His faith removed mountains, His hope had no shadow in it, His love was infinite.

Of these two pictures of a pattern for life and for a basis for social, economic, political, and religious stability and success and peace, which do you choose as the ultimate winner? Does anyone doubt which philosophy of life will be the eventual winner? And then remember that the central feature in the real Christian philosophy points and leads to the unification of the whole of mankind.

Unity of family, of tribe, of city, State, and Nation have been successively attempted and fully established. World unity is now the final goal toward which a harassed humanity is slowly striving. Nation building seems to have come to a standstill, except perhaps temporarily and artificially by force of arms. The anarchy inherent in state sovereignty when carried to its ultimate is moving us all toward a climax. A world growing to maturity must abandon this fetish, in the interest of all our fellow men, recognizing the oneness and wholeness of human relationships, and establish once for all the machinery that can best incarnate this great fundamental principle of its life.

We blame the munitions makers, the international bankers, crooked diplomats, and unwise statesmen for war. But what, if they are the cause, are we going to do about it? After so placing the blame it seems to me that we have done absolutely nothing about it of a constructive nature. All corrective measures at least have failed. By the vote of this Congress we have even removed the restrictions against the sale of munitions. Is it not evident therefore that something new and untried must be the answer, rather

than the false cures and remedies we have so unsuccessfully sought to apply?

How can we control international problems except with international machinery? Our mistake is that we have tried to do it with local or national laws. I suggest an international organization for peace and contend that the preordained unity of the human race implies the establishment of a world commonwealth in which all nations, races, creeds, and classes are closely and permanently united, and in which the autonomy of its state members, and the personal freedom and initiative of the individuals that compose them, are definitely and completely safeguarded as they are here in the United States.

This commonwealth must, so far as I can visualize it, consist of a world legislature, whose members will, as the trustees of the whole of mankind, ultimately control the resources of the component nations, and will enact such laws as shall be required to satisfy the needs and adjust the relationships of all races and peoples.

A world executive, backed by an international police force contributed on a proportional basis, will aid in preserving the peace of the world and in seeing that its international laws are obeyed and its organic unity is safeguarded. A world tribunal must adjudicate and deliver its compulsory and final verdict in all disputes arising between the various nations. That would be better than settling disputes by war, would it not? At least that is the way we settle disputes in this country between States and between people, so I assume it is a qualified method.

A world script, a world literature, a uniform and universal system of currency, of weights and measures, will simplify education, trade, and business problems and will produce a better, friendlier understanding among the nations and races of mankind. In such a world society, science and religion, the two greatest forces in human life, could be reconciled and would work together instead of out of harmony, as they seem to be now as we practice the art of war.

If these words and thoughts which I have expressed are not true, and if they are not in complete accord with the experience and wisdom of the ages; if they are not in accord with the eternal laws of the Creator, then they can but fail of realization. But if they are true, is it not the duty of yourself and all of us to bring them into fruition and realization with every ounce of energy and talent at our command, and in the name of peace?

Monica Williams has penned a poem just fitted for this occasion. What more fitting conclusion can I append than this:

"LOVE WILL NOT FAIL"

"There are no words with which to voice our grief
That war has come—no tears with which to weep,
For hearts in anguish a deep silence keep,
And minds are lulled to kindly unbelief.
It cannot be! There is no laurel wreath,
No joyous song of triumph that will leap
From muted throats; we know we can but reap,
The sorrow which all cruel wars bequeath.

"And yet we wonder why such things must be;
Have we but built our house upon the sand,
Is there no good that evil shall prevail,
No God of Love to guide humanity?
Then let us look within and understand
That when we serve God first love will not fail."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the real issues with regard to this legislation are comparatively simple ones. In the first place, this bill provides for giving very modest pensions to the widows and dependent children of deceased World War veterans. The language of the bill means that the head of the Veterans' Administration must determine that the widow or children involved are "dependent" before they will be eligible to receive the small amount provided in the bill. That, in turn, it seems to me, proves that whatever amounts may be expended under the terms of this bill are going to be either in lieu of relief or assistance now given to those people, or else they will go to people who ought to be getting some assistance and are not. One of those two things is going to be the case.

The matter of the tax burden on the farmers has been mentioned. I would like to point out that if the Federal Government does what is here proposed for the widows and orphans of its veterans, the tax burden on farmers is going to be relieved rather than increased, for the reason that, so far as I know, most of the taxes that farmers pay are local taxes and not Federal taxes. The Federal tax burden is a much better distributed burden with regard to ability to pay than local tax burdens are.

Why should we do this? I think it is on the ground—and I believe it is good ground—that America's idea differs from

the idea of some other nations in the world. America believes that the soldiers who fight her wars are not just cannon fodder. I hope we shall never forget that it is the soldier who fights the war, not the soldier who makes the war. It is no more than right to give to those men who were the soldiers of America that peace of mind which will come from the knowledge that a grateful Government will make some modest provision for those whom this man leaves behind when he passes on. I believe that the matter of fact is that to the average human it makes a lot more difference as he faces the hour of death to know what is going to be the future of his wife, his family, and his dependents than anything else, and I believe that in some respects this is even more important than what you do for him while he lives.

Before I have to take my seat I do want to say, the matter of service-connected veterans having been mentioned—and perhaps I may be pardoned for making reference to it—that I have introduced in that connection a bill (H. R. 6450) which provides that in determining service-connection a man's service record shall be taken into account and that if the service record indicates that the experience which he had in the service is such as to be reasonably expected to have caused the disability from which he suffers, then the burden of proof no longer rests on him to prove that his disability is service connected. That bill applies to all combat veterans.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman offer an amendment to this bill covering that point?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is entirely different legislation. I am a member of this committee and I do not like to do that on a bill that my own committee has reported, and possibly complicate the situation. I believe in it very much and I am hopeful that our committee is going to report that bill in due course.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, for over 20 years I have been actively engaged in the problems of the veteran and his dependents. During this period I have always endeavored to acquire first-hand information on any veteran problem by not only carrying on correspondence with veterans throughout the country but also by personal contact. On such missions of fact seeking I have always been able to determine the likes and dislikes of the rank and file of veteranism. With such first-hand information available, it has been an easy task for me to gauge the actual needs of those to be benefited from any proposed legislation that had my active support and best efforts.

As usual, when Congress considers legislative measures benefiting the disabled veteran or his dependents, certain organizations speaking for a minority of veterans who happen to be fortunate enough not to be in need and who are employed in gainful occupations or professions and who have no personal knowledge or information of the facts relating to the actual needs of legislation for disabled veterans and their dependents, join with certain publishers in ridiculing not only the legislation but the several veteran organizations who are trying to legislate for that citizen and his dependents who in time of war defended this Nation. In a few words, this handful of perennial objectors do not stop in raising their voices in holy horror but, in addition, resort through ignorance or neglect to the dissemination of false and misleading propaganda.

Contrary to what the public has been asked to believe, the legislation this House is now considering, H. R. 9000, a bill providing more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, has the support of the World War veterans of this country who speak through two great major veteran organizations, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, with a combined active membership of over one million and a half.

At this point I insert a letter from John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, and also a letter from Millard W. Rice, legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1940.

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: As a result of the discharge petition filed by Congressman RANKIN, our widows' and orphans' bill, H. R. 9000, comes up in the House on Monday, May 13, for a vote.

Although every Congressman has been requested by the American Legion in his congressional district to support and vote favorably for this piece of legislation, I have recently learned that attempts are being made to spread the rumor around through the House that this legislation was not on the American Legion program.

In order to correct any such false impression, let me state very definitely that H. R. 9000 is the American Legion bill for the protection of World War widows and orphans and I shall appreciate very much if you will see to it that this information is given to the Members of the House.

I appreciate your personal interest in the welfare of the World War veterans and their dependents and I can assure you that the Legion throughout the country is looking for an overwhelming vote of approval of this bill on Monday.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., May 13, 1940.

The Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: This is to assure you that H. R. 9000 has the strong support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This bill is not as generous in its provisions as we think it ought to have been, but it is a big step in the right direction, and therefore has V. F. W. approval.

The V. F. W. thinks there is ample justification for payment of Federal pensions to the dependent widows and orphans of deceased World War veterans, who had been honorably discharged after 90 days or more of service, on the same bases and in the same amounts as have long been provided for the widows and orphans of deceased Spanish-American War veterans. Such pensions were provided to the widows and orphans of all 90-day Spanish-American War veterans within about 16 years after the official termination of that war, whereas it is now nearly 22 years since the termination of hostilities in the World War.

In view of the great number of unemployed persons, particularly in the older-aged groups, there is a great need for the payment of such pensions.

It is said by some that old-age and survivorship insurance benefits under Social Security laws now make provisions for widows and orphans. That statement is true only in part. Perhaps not more than half of the veterans in this country are engaged in "covered" occupations. No survivorship insurance benefits are provided for those workers, and their dependents, not engaged in covered occupations. No such survivorship benefits are payable to the widows unless they have minor children, or until after they have passed the age of 65. Therefore, it would perhaps be found that not more than one-fourth of the widows of deceased World War veterans would be entitled to any Social Security survivorship benefits.

It is true that aid to dependent children benefits are available for the dependent children of deceased World War veterans, but in amounts which vary in different States from \$8.09 per month in Arkansas to \$59.05 per month in Massachusetts. If the dependent children of deceased World War veterans now receiving such aid to dependent children benefits, plus those potentially eligible therefor, were to be taken care of in toto by the Federal Government by payment of pensions by the Veterans Administration, then it would be possible for the States to provide more generously for the dependent children of other citizens, and thus be entitled to more matching money from the Federal Social Security Board. Precisely the same relationship exists between pensions for the dependent parents of deceased World War veterans on the one hand and old-age assistance for other citizens on the other hand. The total load to organized society would not be increased, as to the dependent widows and orphans of deceased World War veterans, merely shifted from the local communities and States to the Federal Government, where it properly belongs.

If this Nation can afford to engage in wars, then it can afford to take care of the human aftermath of war. The human aftermath of war should be considered as a part of the cost of security for America, and is certainly an important factor in our Nation's long-sighted national defense program.

We believe that this legislation will prove advantageous as to every local community, as to every State, and for the best interests of the country at large.

We do believe that the benefits provided for the dependent widows and orphans of deceased World War veterans should be in

more generous amounts than provided for by this bill, but, being a step in the right direction, we sincerely hope that it will meet with the approval of Congress, and be enacted into law before its adjournment.

With kindest regards, I am

Respectfully yours,

MILLARD W. RICE,
Legislative Representative.

The question of benefits for the widows, orphans, and dependent parents of deceased World War veterans has been considered over a period of years by the posts, departments, and national conventions of both these veteran organizations.

The ladies' auxiliaries of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, with a combined membership of nearly a million wives, mothers, and sisters of World War veterans, who are in daily contact with veterans' problems in every hamlet, town, and city of the Nation, have analyzed this question thoroughly.

The World War Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives has held hearings on this question time and time again. Therefore, when H. R. 9000 was perfected in committee and reported to this House, the veteran organizations, their auxiliaries, and the World War Veterans' Committee definitely knew the need existed for this type of legislation.

Those who oppose this legislation have made the erroneous statement that the widow, orphan, and dependent parent of every World War veteran, as well as future dependents, will receive a pension when this bill, H. R. 9000, becomes a law, and that the resultant cost will total over \$100,000,000 annually.

To refute such an erroneous assertion, let us talk facts for a few moments by analyzing this bill, which provides a meager monthly payment of \$20 to a widow with no child, \$28 to a widow with one child, \$34 to a widow with 3 children, \$15 to the dependent mother and father if living, or \$20 to the surviving parent. The total compensation to the widow, child, or children cannot exceed \$56 monthly.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that this bill will make eligible for benefits during the first year 30,500 widows alone, 66,000 widows with children, 23,500 children alone, and the dependent parents of 32,800 deceased World War veterans. The Veterans' Administration assumes that only one-half of all eligible widows, children, and dependent parents will apply. This assumption is based on the experience of the Veterans' Administration, who asserts that a certain percentage entitled to benefits are ignorant of the law, others are not interested, while the majority cannot meet the requirements.

If one-half of the number of eligible widows, orphans, and dependent parents apply for benefits, as estimated by the Veterans' Administration, the annual cost, we are told, will be \$19,957,000 for the widows and orphans, with the sum of \$4,236,000 required to care for the dependent parents, or a grand total of \$24,193,000.

You will note that the Veterans' Administration estimated the above cost; but, gentlemen, in very closely analyzing the needs clause which one must comply with before becoming eligible the total cost, when this is considered, will be much less. Let me add at this point that the objectors to this bill have deliberately ignored the needs clause in their false propaganda bent on destroying this legislation.

On page 1, line 7, of the bill, you will note the word dependent is used and applies to the widow, child or children, mother or father of any deceased World War veteran having served 90 days or more and being honorably discharged. That word dependent will render ineligible approximately 75 percent of those referred to by the Veterans' Administration as eligible, because it embodies the needs clause. An official interpretation of the needs clause is contained in the following quotation taken from a letter received from Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

Should the bill in its present form be enacted into law, in determining the dependency of a widow the Veterans' Administration would employ a rule somewhat similar to that now applying in the determination of dependency pertaining to parents. Under the existing regulations, there is used as a guide the rule that where the income of one such person is \$50 per month there arises a presumption that dependency does not exist. However, dependency

may be established notwithstanding the \$50 income rule if conditions are shown to exist which warrant a determination that the income of the widow is insufficient to provide for her reasonable needs.

From General Hines' definition of the needs clause I hope you are convinced that only those persons who have an income of \$50 or less monthly will be entitled to benefits. Today, with the average age of widows 46 years and the dependent parent 75 years, one can readily see that with such a low income the majority of these eligibles must be on the relief rolls of our country. If relief statistics were available, I could show you in dollars and cents where the cost of this legislation would be simply transferred from the relief and old-age assistance rolls to the honor roll of our country—which is comprised of those and their dependents who by their loyalty and service were declared worthy of a monthly pension by a grateful Government.

The cost of maintaining the honor roll of our country represents not only the cost of war but likewise the cost of the aftermath of war. Hence it is time the American people realize that war and its aftermath are costly.

When this country goes to war the people know and expect the Government to perpetuate its policy of granting pensions to its defenders and their dependents. Sacrifices in time of war must not only be made by the Nation's armed forces but likewise by the citizens of the country. As an aftermath of the war, the sacrifices made by the Nation's defenders entitling them and their dependents to benefits represent in cost the cheapest and greatest insurance this country can ever have in safeguarding the future welfare and security of this Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The statement was made awhile ago that the American Legion had not passed on this proposition for several years. I call attention to the fact that the National Executive Committee of the American Legion, at its November 1939 meeting, considering the vast number of resolutions comprising the Legion's 1940 legislative program, selected as its first one Government protection of widows and orphans.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this measure, let us stroll down memory's lane to the frantic days of 1917-18 when the youth of this Nation marched off to war with not only the good wishes of all citizens but likewise the assurance of this country's gratitude for the service to be rendered.

Today, 23 years after, it is hard for me to believe that these same citizens who imparted their blessings in 1917-18 are now opposing the payment of benefits to the widow and orphan, the mother and father of the deceased World War veteran.

No, gentlemen; the American people are not ingrates. They recognize the honor roll of our country and today stand shoulder to shoulder with America's great veteran organizations—the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States who are asking you to approve H. R. 9000. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to follow the distinguished leader of World War veterans and former commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. I heartily agree with his views and desire to say that I was among the first Members of the House to sign the discharge petition and have actively supported H. R. 9000, providing benefits to the widows and orphans of the veterans of the World War, since it was first introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I favor increasing the present benefits to the Gold Star Mothers and also increasing the benefits to the widows and

orphans of World War veterans in service-connected cases, for the sums now being paid are clearly inadequate. For the same reasons and upon the same grounds, I favor the pending measure to pay benefits to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans who were unable to establish service connection.

During the time I have served as a Member of this House I have many times appeared before the Board of Veterans' Appeals in behalf of veterans in my district, and it has been forcibly brought to my attention how extremely difficult it is to establish service connections; and I am certain that almost every Member of this body has had the same experience. This difficulty is not the fault of the veteran but is due to the faulty and incomplete medical and service records which were kept. Consequently, many thousands—I am advised it runs into hundreds of thousands—of World War veterans have attempted and failed to establish service connection. The first group of beneficiaries under this bill will be the widows and orphans of these veterans who are not now eligible to benefits because service connection has not and cannot be established. Certainly taking care of these worthy cases is in itself sufficient justification for the enactment of this legislation.

I support the bill upon the further ground that I consider it to be essentially and fundamentally a national-defense measure and therefore very timely. We are appropriating billions of dollars for the Army and Navy, and properly so, in view of world conditions. I have supported and shall continue to actively support every measure to strengthen our national defense on the land, sea, and in the air. I favor our having aerial, military, and naval defenses superior to any nation or combination of nations on earth. It is true that modern warfare is becoming highly mechanized and motorized, and that most of the fighting is being done with planes, machines, tanks, and manifold engines of destruction. However, the most important factor in the equation of war still remains the human factor—living, breathing, human beings of flesh and blood, whose intelligence, ingenuity, and skill are required to direct, operate, and control the various devices and instrumentalities which science and invention have provided. The war cannot be fought and conducted by robots fashioned of metal. Therefore it is most important—indeed, it is imperative—in order to stimulate and fortify the patriotism and devotion of the young manhood of our country and the young fathers who might be called upon to defend the lives and property of our people against foreign attack, that their loved ones, their widows and children, will be cared for by the United States Government. I consider it a serious reflection upon our Republic that the widow and child of any veteran who has defended our country should ever be compelled to go on relief and be treated as indigent. Let us show our gratitude and appreciation to the defenders of our country in this hour when the world is rapidly becoming one vast battlefield.

We must continue to keep out of foreign wars and avoid every action which might involve us. Our Neutrality Act has now been in effect 6 months and has proved so successful that we are the only neutral nation in the world which has not lost a single ship or the life of a single citizen. At the same time, we must increase and strengthen our national defense, and by the passage of this legislation inspire our young men and citizens of all ages to renewed patriotism and loyalty and to the service and defense of our country and our institutions against external and internal attack.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the reasons why I shall vote for the pending bill, as I have voted for every measure in the interests of the veterans of all our wars, their widows and dependents, which have come before Congress while I have been a Member of this House. Both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are to be complimented on sponsoring this meritorious legislation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a misapprehension on the part of a good many of the speakers that we

are giving the pension provided in this bill to the dependents of those who trained on college campuses. I want to tell you from my experience that I find a good many of the pensioners today receiving the highest compensation are those who never left the United States. I have a case in point I would like to mention. We had a soldier who trained 3,000 miles away from the eastern seaboard. That is as far as he got. He got his feet wet one night training out there in California. He died some time ago from tuberculosis. His dependents receive compensation now because it was considered service-connected. I would take nothing from his dependents because the kind of service he had was not of his choosing; and if he died it was just as effective as if an enemy's bullet ended his life. But think of the 600,000 men who served in the Navy during the war, and most of them were in the submarine zone at some time or other. Think of the 2,000,000 men who served in the Army on the other side. In recognition of their service I believe something is due them and certainly their widows and children should receive our most solicitous care. Many of these people have given more service than the men who served behind the eastern seaboard during the war. That is why I believe it is no more than just and right that those who are unable to show service connection but who gave their best for their country as did the men who stood knee deep and waist deep in the mud of the trenches for as much as 16 months and came out as you will say without a scratch, should receive consideration. They paid in some way for this terrible experience. Their dependents now under the law cannot get any compensation at all because their loved one happened to fall off a street car or something like that in the last few months. Far better for the widow and orphans if that veteran had died on the field of battle. I believe this bill is just and right since it will correct this inequitable treatment and I propose to defend it to my people and I am sure you can do so with equanimity when you go home. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the Rules Committee of the House failed to grant a rule to bring this bill, H. R. 9000, to the floor of the House for consideration. It was necessary for the friends of the bill to resort to petition. I was one of the 218 Members of the House who promptly signed the petition, and by that action the friends of the bill made it possible to have the bill up for consideration today, and I now rise in its support.

For more than 21 years on the floor of the House and Senate I have from time to time said that the best dollar that this country has spent and could spend for national defense is to take care of our disabled veterans and their dependent widows, children, and parents. That is my attitude of mind today. We have and are spending billions of dollars for national defense. Ships, fortresses, arms, and armaments would mean little unless we had patriotic men with which to man them.

I have also said that this great, powerful, and rich Republic should never permit its defenders and their widows and orphans to become the objects of common charity; and nothing could add to the patriotic fervor of those who offer their lives in defense of this Nation than the consciousness that our country will express its gratitude to them and will not desert them or their dependents in time of need.

Certain individuals and organizations in this country insist that individual townships, counties, and States take care of the veterans and their dependents. The care of our defenders and their widows and orphans is not a local township, county, or State responsibility. It is the responsibility of the entire Nation. Our boys went out to fight under the Stars and Stripes in defense of the entire Nation. The economic and financial ability to assist the veterans and their dependents is vastly different in one section to that of another. The rural and poorer sections of the country furnish the greatest percentage of soldiers. They are the least able to

provide care and help to the veterans and their dependents, and, of course, there would be wide discrimination between the veterans and their dependents of one section over the veterans and their dependents of another section. They fought for the Nation as a whole, and the Nation as a whole should carry out its obligation to them. It is unfair for one section to have a monopoly on the wealth and the other section to have a monopoly on the patriotism.

FOOD, CLOTHING, AND SHELTER AS WELL AS TEARS

In a few days, on May 30, the business of the Nation will be hushed and we shall gather at the graves of our departed defenders, under the spreading oak, elm, poplar, and pine, in the valleys and on the mountainside, in the quiet country churchyard and in the great cities of the dead throughout the Nation, and strew flowers upon their graves and mingle our tears with the tears of their widows, children, and aged parents, in an effort to show our gratitude to those who gave or offered to give their lives as the supreme sacrifice. This, of course, is most commendable.

But what is uppermost in the mind of every true man? What is his greatest concern? It is, What will become of my wife and children and aged and dependent parents when I am gone? Many of these widows, orphan children, and dependent parents who will gather at these graves with you and me on Memorial Day are out of employment. They are destitute. They are in need of food, shelter, and clothing. If I should vote against this bill and on that day shed a tear and place some beautiful flowers on a deceased veteran's grave, if he could speak again he would say, "Mr. ROSSION, withhold your tears and flowers. If you want to do something for me, make it possible for my dear ones to have some food, shelter, and clothing"; and feeling that way, I am very happy today to give this measure my earnest, active, and wholehearted support. In speaking and voting for this bill I feel that I have—and if this bill is written into law, this Nation has—expressed its gratitude in higher and more forceful terms than by many of us making eloquent speeches, dropping tears, or strewing their graves with flowers. In fact, speaking for myself alone, if I should vote against this bill I should feel constrained to remain away from veterans' graves on Memorial Day.

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

This bill will pay \$20 a month to the widows of World War veterans whose death was not due to service and who left no child. It provides for \$28 a month to a widow with 1 child, \$34 a month to a widow with 2 children, and \$4 a month for each additional child. This will benefit 66,700 widows of World War veterans with children. If the veteran leaves no widow and only 1 child, the child will receive \$12 a month. No widow but 2 children will receive \$18 a month, equally divided. No widow but 3 children, \$24 per month, equally divided, with \$3 per month for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided. If the deceased World War veteran leaves a dependent mother or father, either would receive \$20 a month, or if he leaves both, \$15 a month each. There is a limitation of \$56 to the widow, child, or children of deceased World War veterans. This bill will benefit 23,500 children of World War veterans who left no widows.

It is conservatively estimated that the annual cost of this legislation will be \$19,957,000. There will be additional costs to include widows who were married between July 3, 1921, and May 3, 1938, and where a child was born of that marriage where the child is now over 18 years of age and not in school. It is believed this bill will aid approximately 16,400 dependent fathers and mothers, and in view of the dependency provision in the bill, it would cost approximately \$4,236,000.

ALL WARS COSTLY

All wars are costly, and the winner, as a general rule, is the loser. Before we have quit paying the World War will have cost this Nation at least the enormous sum of \$100,000,000,000. If we should get into the present war, it would be even more destructive of life and property, and the expense to the American people would be even greater than the last war. If we are going to have wars, we are going to have

dead, maimed, and crippled veterans, also widows, orphans, and dependent parents. I am unwilling to see another American boy slaughtered or maimed, and another American widow and orphan children and dependent parents made by sending American boys to fight in an effort to settle European, Asiatic, or African quarrels. Let those in the industrial and economic life as well as others of the Nation, know that if we have wars they will be followed by debts, deficits, and burdensome taxes, as well as tears and sorrow, and in the end the greatest loss of all—our liberty. Dictators are raised and thrive on wars and their terrible consequences.

NO FAVORITISM

This Nation granted pensions to the widows and children of deceased veterans whose death was not due to service of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and our Indian wars. Why deny to the dependent widows and orphan children of deceased veterans of the World War the same consideration we granted to these groups in every war this country has ever engaged in? Why favor these groups of one war as against the same groups of the World War? I have always favored the same fair treatment for the dependents of the World War veterans as we have given to these dependents of our other wars. I have time and again introduced bills in the House and Senate for these dependents of the World War similar to the bill that we have before us today.

Yes; this bill will cost some money. I am very much opposed to our country becoming involved in another World War. If we do, we shall have many more dead and maimed veterans and thousands and thousands more of widows and orphans. If we engage in any such war we will then be called upon not to spend millions, as provided in this bill, but billions upon billions.

WHAT GROUPS ARE FIGHTING THIS BILL?

The groups outside of Congress that are fighting this bill are the same groups that made the big profits out of the World War, and many of them are making profits out of the present war and are insisting that we take a bigger hand in helping the Allies. My sympathies are with the Allies, but that is not our war. We tried in the other World War to help settle the centuries-old quarrels of Europe and failed. We shall fail again if we go into it. They have been fighting for more than 2,000 years over some of the same questions and matters now involved, and they will continue to fight for another 2,000 years.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman know that some of the newspapers who editorially have condemned this legislation are those same newspapers who advocate repeal of the Johnson Act so we can give credit to the warring nations?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; I know that. Many of them as well as other groups who have made huge profits out of the war have opposed every bill during my 21 years of service in the House and Senate for the benefit of the defenders of our country and their dependents. Some of these newspapers, periodicals, and radio speakers are urging us to repeal the Johnson Act and even go further. The Allied nations of the last World War now owe us, principal and interest, approximately \$14,000,000,000. How did they happen to owe us this huge sum of money?

In the last World War America was first urged to furnish munitions, guns, and other war supplies. They insisted that they could not win the war unless the United States would do this. After some time they sent another mission to the United States, and they urged unless we furnished credits of billions of dollars that they would lose the war. We furnished these billions. They came out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this Nation. Later on another mission was sent over here and insisted that we must furnish men and ships or they would lose the war. It was then that we called 5,000,000 of the flower of our country into camps and the battle line and sent out ships.

But the Allies soon forgot their solemn obligation to this country to pay back this money. All of them except little

Finland repudiated their debts; and in order that no Congress or administration might in the future be so free with the taxpayers' money, the Johnson Act was passed by Congress, making it unlawful to grant any loans to nations that owed us these war debts and had failed or refused to pay them.

We are now taking the same identical steps that got us into the last World War, except we are moving with much greater rapidity. Last September Congress was called into extraordinary session to repeal the embargo on munitions and war supplies to warring nations. The measure was forced through by the administration. The embargo was repealed and we have been furnishing the Allied countries our latest and best airplanes, guns, ammunition, and other munitions and war supplies. That was step No. 1 in the last World War.

Now a movement has been put on foot in this country by certain groups and big interests to have us repeal the Johnson Act so that this Nation may again loan billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to these warring nations. That was step No. 2 in the last World War. You mark my word—if this is done, these warring nations will take the third step and insist upon us sending men and ships.

I voted against the first step—the repeal of the embargo on arms. I am very much opposed to the second step—the repeal of the Johnson Act and taking billions of dollars from the taxpayers of this Nation and lending it to these warring nations. We might as well give it to them, because they will not pay it back. And then I shall oppose taking the third step of furnishing men and ships. I have been willing all along and have voted for billions to strengthen our national defense. These billions, I insist, must be used only to defend our country and the Monroe Doctrine of the Western Hemisphere.

We helped to win the other war and but for our interference the Allies could and would have marched on German territory and given them a taste of what they had been giving other nations, but President Wilson insisted that that be not done. The German people were never made to suffer the destruction of life and property such as they inflicted on Belgium, France, and other countries. Their country was left intact; and then England and France and other countries stood by and saw these war lords of Germany preparing for the present war in violation of the Treaty of Versailles, without taking any steps to stop them. England and France even took sides with Germany on many important matters.

I can say no good word for Hitler and his like. He is a cruel murderer of innocent men, women, and children. Dictators have risen and fallen in Europe. Hitler, Stalin, and their like will fall. Europe has in the centuries past and gone handled its own dictators. It will handle them this time.

Anyhow, I am unwilling to have American fathers and mothers furnish fine sons every 25 years to go to Europe in an effort to settle their quarrels.

Let us pass this just bill for the widows and dependents of our deceased World War veterans, and stay out of future wars in Europe, Asia, and Africa, mind our own business, and be ready to defend our own country against the attacks of any nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], a member of the committee, such time as he may desire.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that time is limited and we are anxious to allow such time as possible to our other colleagues, I will make only a brief statement. I am intensely interested in this bill. I introduced a somewhat similar bill in order to make provision for the widows and orphans of World War veterans.

Widows and orphans of veterans from every State in the Union reside in my district. This bill will not cost as much as the opponents state. In counties of small population the W. P. A. wage scale runs approximately what this pension runs. Instead of having widows investigated and re-investigated, certified and recertified, and standing in line for a chance to get a pittance for work, it is far better that they be

placed upon the honorable pension rolls. In many localities in many instances this will not make any increase in dollars and cents to the Government, but will be merely paying as a pension what otherwise would have to be paid through local charitable organizations, welfare organizations, W. P. A., or old-age pensions, with the requirement of local participation. The soldier whose dependents are in need fought for the entire Nation, and the entire Nation should participate in his pension.

To show that the recognition of this problem is demanding attention, more than 20 bills were introduced on this subject matter. This bill was carefully considered in the committee; in fact, I would like to have seen an even more liberal bill. Recognizing the problems, and so forth, the committee in its wisdom reported out this bill which will give some measure of relief and is greatly needed. I invite your attention to the data in the printed hearings. This Nation should not be ungrateful to the dependents of veterans who have passed on.

My colleague the gentleman from Florida, Representative HENDRICKS, is en route, and he has asked me to state that he hopes to get here in time to vote for this bill and will vote for it on his arrival. I urge you to vote for this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, what are some of the sacred human obligations which men in general feel must in honor be upheld? What do Christian men who band themselves together in a great religious group, a church membership, regard as their solemn obligation? Is it not to aid and protect their widows and orphans? What do men who band themselves in the mystic ties of fraternity pledge themselves to do if it is not for the protection of their widows and orphans? Shall the Government of the United States do less for the widows and orphans of its defenders? Would those defenders ask for less than that?

This bill is a matter of partial justice—that is, it will help some but it may be inadequate and incomplete. Certainly I am not in favor of discriminating against any class or group of veterans or their widows or dependents. I understand that the widow of a soldier killed in action receives more now than this bill would provide for the widow of a veteran whose death was not service connected. That seems to me fair and right.

As I understand it, Gold Star Mothers receive now \$45 per month, and some of them had to wait a long time before that was provided. Some individual cases come to mind: Long before Mrs. Martha Draper of Wickenburg, Ariz., whose son Howard lost his life in the war, received her present allowance, I felt that she had been neglected and that we were lacking in promptness and adequacy with regard to Gold Star Mothers. I appreciate the ultimate good work of this veterans' committee in regard to that provision.

At this moment a comparatively young woman is dying of tuberculosis on the outskirts of Phoenix. She contracted this dread disease while working for her country in a tubercular hospital, but it is impossible for that fact to be conclusively shown. She is one of a pathetic class of faithful and devoted defenders for whom there is no legal remedy. Of course, this bill does not apply to such individuals. I can think of many things which ought to have been done which have not been done.

In my office are three huge filing cabinets filled with correspondence from veterans in Arizona. Hundreds of times they have written me stating that they are not able to prove service-connected disability but confident in their own mind that their disabilities originated in the war. Of course, we cannot right the wrongs—all the wrongs—growing out of the World War, nor out of any war. Only infinite wisdom can measure such wrongs, and we should not expect finite beings, with the best of intentions, to remedy even a small fraction of such wrongs.

It seems to me that this bill sufficiently prevents those who are merely hangers-on from getting undeserved benefits by the provision that the widow must have married the

veteran on or before the official date of the closing of the World War. In this way the legislation is for the benefit of the courageous and loyal women who went through the horrors of war and paid the same patriotic price which their husbands had to pay. Therefore, the bill seems to me a sound and proper recognition of a sacred obligation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I signed the discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor, and I am happy to support it now.

The objection I have to this measure is that it is too small in the amount of benefits.

This bill calls for but \$20 per month to the dependent mother of a deceased veteran. A paltry \$20. Why, our State of California pays her a pension of \$40, whether or not her son took part in service to her country. And I might say in passing that this is too small an amount. The benefits to widows and orphans are likewise too small.

In a few days we will have a bill in here for millions for war, but we have those here who would deny the families of the victims of war these paltry sums.

Who are the forces opposing this bill? The very interests who 23 years ago were shouting loudest about saving the world for democracy; the very ones who were making patriotic speeches and writing editorials urging someone else's boy to do his duty; the very groups who urged our boys to protect their flag while they stayed at home and accumulated fortunes in the traffic in increased trade because of the war.

Now, lest they might be called upon to pay a small portion of that ill-gotten blood money back in the form of taxes to carry this load, they are howling that this will bankrupt the Treasury.

These same groups are now doing everything in their power to involve us again.

Yes; war costs. It costs tremendously, and this is part of the price we must pay for our last folly.

Some object to this bill because service connection need not be proved. That is what I like about it. Every man in this House knows how difficult it is to get records of injuries received under conditions of warfare.

How many times has each of us had to tell a poor, deserving veteran that we knew to be really eligible for his compensation that we have done all we can, for there is no hospital record?

I need not tell you how often disability appears in later life that no doubt has been caused by hardship and exposure incident to service. Yes; I claim this is the strong point, and so far as I am concerned, I would like to see this matter of service connection removed from all veteran legislation where benefits are in question. [Applause.]

I have supported every piece of veteran legislation that the committee has sent to the floor this year. I believe the committee is fair both to the veterans and to the public. Let us not forget in this year of 1940 the heroes of 1918 who offered their all to their country.

Because the time is growing short and there are many of my colleagues who desire to speak on the bill, I will conclude my remarks by saying that I hope the bill will pass.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the House is considering a bill this afternoon which will provide compensation for many needy widows and dependent children of World War veterans. As one who signed the petition to discharge the committee in order that this bill might be before the House today, I hope it will secure House approval. We now have an opportunity to furnish aid and comfort to a large number of widows and dependent children of World War veterans. This legislation has the approval of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. I was very happy to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] read letters from the legislative representatives of both of these organizations.

This bill provides that claims shall be made at the following rates: Widow but no child, \$20; widow and one child, \$28; widow and two children, \$34, with \$4 for each additional child; no widow but one child, \$12; no widow but two children, \$18, equally divided; no widow but three children, \$24, equally divided, with \$3 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided; dependent mother or father, \$20, or both, \$15 each. As to the widow, child, or children, the total compensation payable cannot exceed \$56. These payments are payable under certain restrictions, one of which is that the widow must have been married to the veteran prior to July 3, 1921, unless a child was born of the marriage to the veteran, in which event the marriage delimiting date is extended to include widows married to the veteran prior to May 13, 1938, in addition to the section of the bill which requires that dependency or need must be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

This legislation is meritorious, and I sincerely urge the Members of the House to support it. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in support of the widows and orphans' bill, H. R. 9000, and hope that the bill will be enacted into law at this session of Congress. As a member of the World War Veterans' Committee I participated in the lengthy hearings on this bill and voted for its passage in the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides compensation benefits to widows, orphans, and dependent parents of World War veterans without regard to the cause of the veteran's death nor whether he had a service-connected disability. I contend that the veteran's loved ones are entitled to compensation regardless of whether he was wounded in battle or saw service overseas. He was in the service of his country in time of war and was doing his duty as a patriotic citizen. Many of these men suffered privations unbearable while in training, contracting influenza and other diseases which have a marked effect on their health to this day. Why should not the widows and orphans of these veterans be given a pension and assure them that they would not have to apply for relief? The widows of Civil and Spanish-American War veterans receive pensions regardless of whether the veteran had been engaged in the actual conflict. Why not include the widow of a veteran of the World War?

It is time in this country for Congress to provide for "him that shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan" and I ask your support of this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, as we sit here considering this bill there comes ringing in my mind a quotation which I have heard somewhere, to this effect:

The bravest battle that ever was fought;
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not;
It was fought by the mothers of men.

In my judgment, the heroic women who looked after these veterans are as justly entitled to some remuneration as were the soldiers themselves.

As we studied this measure we sought to write as fair a bill as we could, and I believe the bill we are now considering will meet with the full approval of the veterans generally and particularly of the leading veterans' organizations. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] such time as he may desire.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, the merits of this great and good measure have been thoroughly discussed and canvassed here today by the able members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. There is nothing new that I could add in behalf of this bill. The necessity for this legislation is clear. It is just and right that this Congress pass this bill. I am for it and will vote for its passage today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana

[Mr. SPRINGER], a past State commander of the American Legion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this legislation. I am firm in my belief that this legislation is sound and constitutes a debt which should be paid by our Government. As the first department commander of the American Legion, in the State of Indiana, and as a past national executive committeeman of this same great peacetime organization, I have had the problem placed before me respecting the dependent widows and orphans of our veterans from the date of the organization of the American Legion to this very hour. Many of these instances are of such sadness in their import that we cannot refrain from reflecting, for the moment, upon the assurances of our Government and our people when our boys marched away in 1917-18 to participate in the World War.

Mr. Chairman, the people then said: "When you boys come back home there will be nothing too good for you." That was the assurance given to our soldiers. The boys proudly marched away firmly believing that the people of our country, and our own Government, would meet their pledge. After our Army, and our Navy, and our Air Corps had fully participated in the World War, and after the war was over the boys came back home—leaving thousands of my comrades upon the battlefields who gave their lives for their country, and in the cemeteries in France many thousands of my comrades who died of wounds suffered in battle and from disease and exposure were buried. Those who returned to our country, and who had borne the hardship of war, many of them were disabled; a vast number were gassed and many were wounded; all of them had suffered the horrors of the clatter of musketry, the bursting of bombs and the screaming of shells about them; many were maimed and the scars of battle were apparent. Our soldiers came from every walk in life. Their jobs which were held in civil life had been assured to them upon returning.

Yet, when our soldiers came home in a very large majority of the cases, some other fellow had their jobs. When the veteran applied for his old job there was no place for him. Many of these veterans were married, and some of them had families, and when they were severed from the service the allotments made for their families ceased. There was no further assistance from the Government. The people who did not experience the pangs of war in those days cannot visualize the mental anguish suffered by the veterans who met those unfortunate circumstances. The wives and the children of those veterans suffered untold sadness and agony because the breadwinner of the family had served his country in time of peril.

Mr. Chairman, the peak of the disability of those veterans has not yet been reached. Many of them have died, and many of them are totally disabled. Yet, when strong and healthy men are called upon to bare their breasts to the enemy's bullet, when they are taken away from their homes and their families, there is an obligation resting upon that Government to care for those men—and, in case of their death, leaving a widow and a child or children, or parents, who are dependent within the meaning of the law upon them—does not that same Government owe a duty and an obligation to them? The answer is obvious, and the duty and the obligation is inescapable. We must remember that wars cost money and the toll in the lives of men is heavy. And when any government sends her own men into war the obligation to care for them and the families of those who lose their lives or who die from the effects of the war, continues; could any nation propose to do less? And, may I ask, if any nation should propose to do less for her defenders and protectors would not that nation be entirely ungrateful?

We must remember the Rankin bill, now before us, will grant a meager assistance to the widows and children of the veteran. Additional assistance is extended to dependent parents when that dependence is established. Many of these aged parents, who would be able to qualify under this law if it is passed, are now upon the relief rolls; many of the widows of the veterans are drawing relief assistance,

and those with children are struggling to educate their offspring in order to give them a chance in life. If this proposal is enacted into law it will take those people off of the relief rolls in our Nation and assure to them some assistance whereby they will be able to maintain themselves and their children without the untold misery and anguish which usually attends poverty. It will give to those widows of our veterans the opportunity to educate their children which they have not experienced heretofore. This measure is not only a humanitarian one but it is the discharge of a duty and an obligation which our Government owes.

Mr. Chairman, may I say, at this point, that as the present war rages in Europe, where death, destruction, and devastation is apparent on every hand, we owe, first, the duty of discharging our moral obligations of the last war to those who felt the sting of it. Yet, too, we must stand foursquare upon the ground and abstain from any participation in this war. Yes, wars cost. The cost cannot be estimated in a monetary value. The dollar-and-cent estimate is small—yes, small indeed. When we recognize the destruction of the home comes from war, when we reflect upon the separation of families which comes from war, when we know that the lives of men are lost in war and that disability and disease grow out of it, when we appreciate that want and famine ever follow in the wake of war, that women and children are made to cry and to suffer because of war, then we want no more of it. Yet, if our Government participates in war and sends our men and boys into it, then our Government is under a lasting obligation to pay the damages which are suffered by the people who participate in it. That is the redress which is provided by this bill. I urge the passage of this legislation because it is right. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that in a good many years of experience with the veterans I have never had, so far as I can remember, any letter from any disabled veteran or Gold Star Mother, or other mother or widow, protesting against the compensation that was paid, or was about to be paid, to any other veteran or veteran's dependents.

May I state also, Mr. Chairman, that the veterans did not know where they were to serve, whether they were to serve in this country, or across the seas. That was in the hands of those in high command of the Army and of the Navy. How can we discriminate in all justice against any group?

A great deal has been said about the dependency clause in this bill. I wish to state again that while usually General Hines decides that a man or woman or child is dependent if he or she has an income of less than \$50 a month, in many cases he will decide that an income as low as \$35 a month does not constitute dependency.

The following letter which I have received from General Hines tells part of his dependency rulings:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 10, 1940.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Reference is made to your telephonic request of today for information concerning the criteria used by the Veterans' Administration in making determinations of dependency.

Paragraph 1057 of the Regulations of the Veterans' Administration, dealing with the conditions which determine dependency, provides as follows:

"(A) Dependency will not be held to exist if the father or mother, or both, have an income sufficient to provide for their reasonable support and maintenance, including clothing and necessary medical treatment for themselves and members of the family under legal age, or of any age if mentally or physically incapacitated.

"(B) In determining the amount of income in a given case, account will be taken of the net income from property of every character owned by the mother or father or other members of the family under legal age, and of the earnings received by such father or mother or such other members of the family under legal age. Account will not be taken of the incomes of other members of the family of legal age, but only of the actual contributions made by such members of the family.

"(C) The fact that the veteran has made habitual contributions to his father or mother, or both, is not conclusive evidence that dependency existed.

"(D) The fact that the father or mother or other member of the family is a beneficiary of any insurance granted under the War Risk Insurance Act or World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as

amended, will be disregarded in determining dependency, as will also the receipt of any donations or assistance from charitable sources.

"(E) The remarriage of a parent does not, per se, bar entitlement, but is prima facie evidence that dependency has ceased."

Additionally, under the practice of the Veterans' Administration a presumption of nondependency is considered to exist when the incomes received by parents are as follows: When a mother or a father has an income of more than \$50 per month or if there be both a mother and a father living together and their combined income exceed \$90 per month, with \$20 per month additional allowance for each additional member of the family under legal age, or of any age if mentally or physically incompetent.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Administrator.

We have in this widows' compensation bill a provision that we have not had before in a pension bill.

I also wish to call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that this is a recognition, if you will, of the part women played during the World War. They played an extremely important part and a very difficult one. I have always felt that they served just as truly as did the men. Women were left behind to carry the load, often with little children. Many of them did not have enough money to keep body and soul together. I wonder how often we think of the role these women played. If you have worked with them, I do not believe you will ever forget, and I know you have, the expression in the eyes of these women who sent their men to fight across the seas knowing that they might never see them again. These women were left behind. They had no training in business, no training by which they could earn a livelihood, but they did not complain. They went through a strain just as did the men. They lived in an agony of fear and apprehension that the man they loved more dearly than their own lives might any minute be killed or injured. Those women, young then for the most part, looked old too soon. They went under a nervous strain which was to take its toll upon them just as it did upon the men. The men were supposed to have had nervous break-downs as a result of their service, but do you not suppose the women underwent enough at that time also to have nervous break-downs? Clearly no one would begrudge the women of the veterans who served during the war this pittance.

Many of the veterans ought to have service connection for their claims. You who have battled with the Veterans' Administration, many times against them, realize there is many a case that ought to be service-connected but which never has been service-connected. This would in a small measure do justice to those cases which should have been service-connected.

It would, in a small degree, compensate the widow of the veteran who was never able to establish a service connection, perhaps because the doctors had died who could give the necessary affidavits to prove his disability came from his service. I understand there are records of hospital treatment that still have not been indexed or separated and placed with the man's service record. Many a man who was once given service connection has been cut upon review. Whose fault it is I do not know, but it is a contemptible situation, and there is many a deserving case where service connection has been severed unjustly.

May I say for those who have been married later on that many of them were engaged, but due to economic conditions they and their fiancées could not marry until a later period. The veterans married after the war period have not married young girls; they have married women their own age.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Members of the House will feel that this is not only right but an extremely just measure. [Applause.]

WHAT THE STATES ARE DOING FOR WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. Chairman, many of the States of the Union make no provision of any kind for the relief of veterans of the World War or their dependents. In order to show the Members just what provision is made in each of the States, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a compilation which I have prepared showing the estimated veteran population of each State and what that State does in the way of relief.

Thirty-four States provide for educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. However, this assistance is small, in most instances about \$150 maximum per child per year, and most States have limited such educational assistance to the end of the fiscal year 1942.

Thirty-one of the States provide varying sums of money for the burial of indigent and needy veterans, as well as a provision in some for marking the grave.

There are other provisions in some of the States to help veterans of the World War, such as abatement of taxes, free tuition at State schools and colleges, and preference in civil service.

Doubtless all of these facts will be taken into consideration when General Hines decides what shall be considered dependency.

PROVISIONS MADE BY EACH STATE FOR RELIEF OF WORLD WAR VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

ALABAMA

Estimated veteran population, 58,693.

Provides educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per child each year. Appropriation, \$2,400 each year through 1942. Also free tuition in State institutions of secondary or college grade.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

ARIZONA

Estimated veteran population, 12,403.

Secretary of state advises \$5,500 per year provided for relief of indigent ex-service men and their dependents who are residents of State 1 year or more.

ARKANSAS

Estimated veteran population, 49,928.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

CALIFORNIA

Estimated veteran population, 234,847.

Provides educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Appropriation of \$25,000 for payment of tuition, fees, books, and for monthly payment of an allowance to cover all or part of the living expenses of the student.

Authorizes counties and municipalities to extend relief to veterans, their widows, minor children, fathers, or mothers, through military, naval, or marine organizations created for that purpose.

COLORADO

Estimated veteran population, 38,867.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

CONNECTICUT

Estimated veteran population, 50,252.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$200 maximum per year per child. Appropriation of \$4,400 biennially until 1944.

Emergency relief of veterans who are eligible for admission to Fitch's Home for Soldiers, but who cannot be cared for at the home owing to a temporary lack of adequate facilities at the home.

Aid to a widowed mother, wife, husband, child, or children of any veteran being cared for at the home, at any hospital, or elsewhere in the State.

Temporary financial assistance to veterans, or to the widows, dependent child, parent, brother, or sister of one who died in service.

Provides for expenditures through the American Legion for food, wearing apparel, medical or surgical aid, care or relief, or funeral expenses for World War veterans, their wives, widows, and dependent children.

DELAWARE

Estimated veteran population, 5,683.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$200 maximum per year per child. Appropriation of \$1,500 annually until June 30, 1942.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

FLORIDA

Estimated veteran population, 46,664.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$300 maximum per child per year. Four thousand dollars appropriated annually until June 30, 1942.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

GEORGIA

Estimated veteran population, 67,057.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

IDAHO

Estimated veteran population, 15,562.

Idaho has what is known as the Veterans' Welfare Commission, carrying an appropriation for direct relief to World War, Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Moro Province, and Boxer Rebellion veterans, who have been bona fide residents of State for a year at least just prior to making application for relief. This is for emergency purposes and is not a pension.

ILLINOIS

Estimated veteran population, 290,156.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service.

Award of scholarships to Normal School and University of Illinois made to residents of State who served in World War.

Provides county aid to veterans and the families of deceased veterans, through veterans' organizations. Relief of widows and children of deceased World War veterans, through the State department of public welfare.

INDIANA

Estimated veteran population, 107,731.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. War orphans exempt from tuition and matriculation fees while attending Indiana University, Purdue University, Indiana State Teachers' College, or Ball State Teachers' College.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

IOWA

Estimated veteran population, 89,790.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per child per year; \$2,500 appropriated.

Each county in the State may levy up to one-fourth mill for soldiers' relief. Indigent veterans or their families who are residents of that particular county are eligible. The State has a disability bonus fund which is paid to permanently or temporarily totally disabled veterans to supplement the aid they receive each month from soldiers' relief.

KANSAS

Estimated veteran population, 65,001.

Veterans, their wives or widows, and minor children are to be supplied with the necessities of life, in their homes. State does not make any direct provisions for relief to World War veterans or their widows or orphans.

KENTUCKY

Estimated veteran population, 72,155.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child; \$3,600 appropriated each year.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

LOUISIANA

Estimated veteran population, 62,404.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$250 maximum per year per child.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

MAINE

Estimated veteran population, 24,394.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child.

Veterans' relief, or State aid: Soldiers and sailors (or families) not to be considered paupers nor sent to poorhouse, but may be removed to or supported by town of their settlement. State aid may be granted to wife, children under 16, infirm and dependent father or mother incapable of self-maintenance, of a World War veteran, resident of State on April 1, 1919, who was honorably discharged, killed in battle, or who is dead or disabled. Limit of \$7 per week for a wife, father, or mother, and \$3 per week for each minor child. No maximum amount for family. Available only to residents of State. Three months constitutes residence for veterans.

MARYLAND

Estimated veteran population, 54,834.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, not to exceed \$150 annually for each war orphan.

Relief of veterans, their widows, and children: State appropriates \$90,000 annually for soldiers' relief (which includes service officers).

MASSACHUSETTS

Estimated veteran population, 154,705.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in action or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$250 maximum per year per child.

Veterans' relief: State aid, military aid, and soldiers' relief to veterans and their dependents. Towns may appropriate money for necessary aid to soldiers and sailors and their families. Prohibits disclosure of names of relief recipients except for official purposes or charitable organizations' work. Extends eligibility for State aid to widows of veterans of the Philippine Insurrection, Spanish-American War, or the China Relief Expedition, if married to such a veteran prior to 1930; to widows of veterans of the Civil War if married

before 1905; to widows of veterans of the Mexican border campaign or the World War if married prior to 1933. Not more than \$20 a month to any one family.

MICHIGAN

Estimated veteran population, 154,304.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount not specified.

Relief for honorably discharged indigent veterans of any war or military expedition and indigent wives, widows, minor children, and mothers of indigent or deceased veterans and female nurses. Administered by Soldiers' Relief Commission in each county. Persons must have been actually resident in county 1 year prior to application.

MINNESOTA

Estimated veteran population, 96,118.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$200 maximum per year per child. \$4,000 appropriated for each fiscal year until June 30, 1942.

Relief: Emergency hospital treatment, maintenance, and relief for veterans suffering from disability, who were bona fide residents of State when need arose. Aid to dependent families of veterans while hospitalized and afterward during necessary period. May supplement compensation, pension, insurance, etc., when exceptional conditions make it necessary. Direct relief provided for disabled veterans and their families. Soldiers' home board authorized to extend relief outside the home to soldiers, widows, deserted wives, children, or parents. Appropriations for year, July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1940, home, statutory, .01 of 1 mill levy; soldiers' welfare, \$25,000; disabled veterans' relief department, \$950,000.

MISSISSIPPI

Estimated veteran population, 42,379.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

MISSOURI

Estimated veteran population, 127,195.

No provision made for World War veterans' relief.

MONTANA

Estimated veteran population, 20,800.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in action or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$250 maximum per year per child. \$3,000 appropriation for biennium.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

NEBRASKA

Estimated veteran population, 45,510.

Relief: Income \$100,000 annually from a State endowment fund of \$2,000,000 is available for food, clothing, shelter, medical and surgical care to any honorably discharged World War veteran who is a bona fide resident of State and in need of relief. Also for wives, widows, and children under 16. Usual monthly allowance, between \$35 and \$50. Handled through veterans' organizations.

NEVADA

Estimated veteran population, 3,750.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Estimated veteran population, 13,965.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child. \$750 appropriated annually until the year 1942.

Relief: Furnished by county commissioners or overseers of poor to honorably discharged veterans of all wars, widows or children, outside a town or county almshouse. Must have resided in State 3 years, and in county 90 days.

NEW JERSEY

Estimated veteran population, 133,767.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child. \$5,000 appropriated annually for carrying out provisions of the act.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

NEW MEXICO

Estimated veteran population, 11,527.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child. \$750 appropriated annually until 1942.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

NEW YORK

Estimated veteran population, 434,891.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$100 maximum per year per person for tuition; \$100 maximum per year for maintenance. \$50,000 appropriated to carry out act.

Relief: \$500 annually during lifetime paid to veterans of any war (including nurses) honorably discharged who are permanently disabled by loss of sight who are not receiving or not entitled to receive a benefit from any existing retirement system to which the State is a contributor. Must have been a resident of State at time of entering service.

Persons honorably discharged from military or naval service and dependents and families of deceased persons honorably discharged from such service, eligible to relief under public welfare law. Must

have resided in State for year next preceding application. Care provided in own homes or suitable institution, but not in almshouse. Relief fund administered by veterans' organizations.

Under the military law a State relief fund is available for sick and disabled World War veterans. Administered by adjutant general through a veterans' relief commission in each assembly district. Applicant must have honorable discharge for at least 60 days' service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918; been a resident of State on May 2, 1923, and at time of making application; be suffering from a 10-percent disability; incapacitated by reason therefor for regular employment; unemployed for 14 days next preceding application and actually in need of assistance. First and second appropriations of \$1,000,000 each provided \$30 a month to a single veteran, \$10 additional per month for dependent wife or widowed mother, and \$5 per month for each additional dependent. Maximum allowed for dependents per month was \$30. Total amount payable to any one applicant, \$250. Amount received from United States Government or other sources deducted. Last appropriation was only \$50,000; therefore it is impossible to grant maximum amount to any one veteran.

NORTH CAROLINA

Estimated veteran population, 72,517.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Scholarships of free tuition in any of State's educational institutions. Free room and board may be provided.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

NORTH DAKOTA

Estimated veteran population, 18,323.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, tuition charges, and fees at a State educational or training institution of a secondary or college grade.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

OHIO

Estimated veteran population, 207,646.

Veterans' benefits relating to education and qualification for the professions and trades. Tuition benefits to World War veterans.

Relief: Any person who is blind and without sufficient means of support and who is unable to provide for himself may receive a sum not to exceed \$400 per annum through county commissioners. Must have become blind while a resident of State and have resided in county 1 year. Such relief shall be in place of all other public relief. If disability can be benefited or removed by surgical or medical care and applicant consents, board of county commissioners may spend for such treatment all or any portion of the relief which they would award to such person for 1 year.

Soldiers' Relief Act applies to all indigent World War veterans, their wives, widows, indigent parents, minor children, and wards who have been bona fide residents of State 1 year and of county 6 months who, in opinion of soldiers' relief commission, are in need of relief. Commission appoints township or ward committees, who receive applications for aid, investigate such applications, and report in May of each year to the commission, which determines amount of monthly allowance payable by county auditor. In case of emergency, immediate relief may be granted.

OKLAHOMA

Estimated veteran population, 76,958.

Relief: Soldiers' relief commission provides assistance to minor dependents of destitute, disabled, and deceased soldiers, sailors, nurses, and marines of Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, and World War, as follows: Group 1 receiving preference: (1) Widow not receiving Government compensation and has minor dependents, and/or orphans of deceased veterans, residents of State for 3 years; (2) Veterans with minor dependents who are either permanently or temporarily totally disabled or have accepted hospitalization and do not draw compensation; (3) Veteran who is in a penal institution or has suffered economic disability and has minor children who must suffer.

OREGON

Estimated veteran population, 41,328.

Relief: County courts levy a property tax to create funds for relief of indigent honorably discharged veterans of any war. Must have resided in State 3 years and in county 1 year. Relief extended to indigent widows and minor children. Administration through commanders of veterans' organizations, working with county clerks. In counties of over 100,000 a relief officer is appointed by county commissioner.

PENNSYLVANIA

Estimated veteran population, 295,400.

Scholarship: War Orphans' Appropriation Act provides not exceeding \$200 per year to war orphans between ages of 16 and 21, who have lived in State 5 years. Only children whose fathers were legal residents of State at time of entering service and were killed in action or died from wounds or other causes, between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, are eligible.

Relief: State relief fund to take care of emergency situations in families of deceased and disabled veterans. Unmarried veterans if disabled, eligible—facts of individual case govern. No specified amount in each case; is determined on facts presented. Does not take place of State and county funds for mothers' assistance, although it may be used during waiting period until case is accepted for mothers' assistance.

Biennial appropriations: \$890,000 for State veterans' commission for needy veterans and dependents. Four hundred thousand dollars for education of war orphans. Two hundred and two thousand dollars for State soldiers' and sailors' home.

RHODE ISLAND

Estimated veteran population, 23,302.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service: Amount, \$200 maximum per child per annum. One thousand dollars appropriated annually. Act not effective after July 1, 1942.

Relief: World War veterans, honorably discharged, in need of assistance due to illness or disability, are eligible for State veterans' relief administered by division of soldiers' relief. Must have been legal resident of State upon entering service or have been a qualified voter of State for 2 years next preceding application. Aid may be extended to dependent families of such persons if they also are residents of State. Illness or disability need not have been caused by war service. Eighty thousand dollars annually appropriated for this purpose.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Estimated veteran population, 39,991.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child. Two thousand dollars appropriated annually until 1942. Also tuition benefits provided for World War veterans.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Estimated veteran population, 25,735.

Free tuition in State institutions for all honorably discharged ex-service men.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

TENNESSEE

Estimated veteran population, 66,266.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service: Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child. Three thousand dollars appropriated annually until June 30, 1942.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

TEXAS

Estimated veteran population, 172,150.

Scholarships: Veterans of World War, including nurses, exempt from all fees and tuition at institutions of higher learning in State. Must have resided in State not less than 12 months prior to registration in institution.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

UTAH

Estimated veteran population, 16,171.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service: Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child. Six hundred dollars appropriated each year until 1942.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

VERMONT

Estimated veteran population, 9,325.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service: Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child. One thousand five hundred dollars appropriated each year.

Relief: Indigent veterans' fund provided by State furnishes aid to indigent persons who are legally dependents of veterans. Must have been resident of State for 1 year next preceding application, which should be made to selectmen of town, mayor of city, or commander of local American Legion post.

VIRGINIA

Estimated veteran population, 70,890.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

WASHINGTON

Estimated veteran population, 65,130.

Provides educational aid (\$150 per annum) for World War orphans attending State schools of secondary or college grade. Provides for free tuition to such students.

Relief: Boards of county commissioners levy in each county of State a special fund for relief to soldiers and sailors. Funds are administered by veterans' organizations. County welfare departments from State and county public-assistance funds supplement this relief where such supplementation is necessary by joint agreement with veterans' organizations concerned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Estimated veteran population, 49,148.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$150 maximum per year per child; \$1,800 appropriated each year until July 1, 1942.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

WISCONSIN

Estimated veteran population, 98,941.

Educational opportunities for children of war veterans killed in service or dying as a result of such service. Amount, \$30 per month while in regular attendance as a student.

Relief: County soldiers' relief commission in each county administers State funds for emergency relief of needy veterans of any war and minor and helpless children and needy parents of deceased veterans. Must be resident of county in which application made. Long-time relief cases referred to county poor relief department at end of emergency period.

WYOMING

Estimated veteran population, 12,673.

No provision for World War veterans' relief.

PROVISION FOR THE PAYMENT OF BURIAL EXPENSES BY THE STATES

Alabama: None.
 Arizona: \$150 maximum.
 Arkansas: None for World War veterans.
 California: \$125 maximum, also headstone.
 Colorado: \$50 for burial, \$20 for headstone.
 Connecticut: \$100 for burial, \$50 maximum for headstone.
 Delaware: \$100 for burial.
 Florida: None.
 Georgia: None.
 Idaho: Not to exceed \$75.
 Illinois: \$100 maximum.
 Indiana: \$75 maximum, \$25 additional for lot.
 Iowa: \$100 maximum, \$15 for headstone.
 Kansas: \$50 maximum, \$20 for headstone.
 Kentucky: None for World War veterans.
 Louisiana: None.
 Maine: \$100 maximum.
 Massachusetts: \$100 maximum for veterans, \$50 for burial of dependent children not over 18.
 Michigan: \$100 maximum.
 Mississippi: None for World War veterans.
 Missouri: None.
 Montana: \$150 maximum.
 Nebraska: \$60 maximum, metal marker furnished for grave.
 Nevada: \$35 maximum.
 New Hampshire: \$100 maximum.
 New Jersey: \$200 maximum, \$50 maximum for headstone.
 New Mexico: \$75 maximum.
 New York: \$100 maximum, \$75 maximum for headstone.
 North Carolina: County allowance for burial of indigent World War veterans.
 North Dakota: None for World War veterans.
 Ohio: \$100 maximum, markers furnished.
 Oregon: \$100 maximum.
 Pennsylvania: \$75 maximum, \$50 maximum for headstone.
 Rhode Island: \$55 maximum, footstones furnished.
 South Carolina: None.
 South Dakota: \$100 if estate insufficient to meet costs.
 Tennessee: None.
 Texas: None for World War veterans.
 Utah: None for World War veterans.
 Vermont: \$150 maximum.
 Virginia: None for World War veterans.
 Washington: \$100.
 West Virginia: \$75 maximum.
 Wisconsin: \$100 maximum.
 Wyoming: \$100.

The following are tables prepared by the Veterans' Administration:

Estimated number of veterans living at the beginning of the year stated, the probability of living being a modification of the American experience table of mortality

[Based on total number engaged in war, 4,764,071]

Beginning of year—

1940	4,041,017
1941	4,007,798
1942	3,970,194
1943	3,931,029
1944	3,890,105
1945	3,847,205
1946	3,802,111
1947	3,752,600
1948	3,700,491
1949	3,645,531
1950	3,587,462
1951	3,526,029
1952	3,458,422
1953	3,387,014
1954	3,311,547
1955	3,231,774
1956	3,147,472
1957	3,055,079
1958	2,957,932
1959	2,855,926
1960	2,749,006
1961	2,637,204
1962	2,516,235
1963	2,390,818
1964	2,261,294
1965	2,128,088
1966	1,991,788
1967	1,842,555

Estimated number of veterans living at the beginning of the year stated, the probability of living being a modification of the American experience table of mortality—Continued

Beginning of year—	
1968.....	1,693,440
1969.....	1,545,493
1970.....	1,399,808
1971.....	1,257,491
1972.....	1,119,616
1973.....	987,193
1974.....	861,148
1975.....	742,332
1976.....	631,534
1977.....	529,457
1978.....	436,704
1979.....	353,717
1980.....	280,719
1981.....	217,695
1982.....	164,392

Estimated number of veterans living at the beginning of the year stated, the probability of living being a modification of the American experience table of mortality—Continued

Beginning of year—	
1983.....	120,367
1984.....	85,021
1985.....	57,593
1986.....	37,178
1987.....	22,683
1988.....	12,954
1989.....	6,853
1990.....	3,328
1991.....	1,462
1992.....	563
1993.....	182
1994.....	46
1995.....	8
1996.....	1

(Budget and Statistics, Apr. 11, 1940.)

Estimated number of living World War veterans at the beginning of each calendar year by age group

Attained age	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
25-29.....												
30-34.....												
35-39.....	11,068	1,414	245	56	2							
40-44.....	1,304,670	765,062	410,535	238,326	90,036	10,691	1,366	236	54	2		
45-49.....	1,823,976	2,102,566	2,136,345	1,934,814	1,655,710	1,254,991	735,415	394,322	228,655	86,295	10,242	1,308
50-54.....	783,698	956,957	1,116,212	1,301,953	1,507,983	1,743,152	2,008,021	2,037,762	1,842,698	1,574,670	1,191,978	697,802
55-59.....	86,583	111,490	225,704	361,738	526,354	709,554	898,946	1,048,225	1,221,810	1,414,901	1,634,450	1,881,052
60-64.....	39,235	44,621	51,462	58,982	67,827	78,937	101,514	206,514	330,950	480,839	646,753	817,375
65-69.....	14,286	16,933	19,620	23,611	28,353	33,968	38,334	44,167	50,653	58,288	67,902	87,451
70-74.....	5,501	6,334	7,170	8,546	9,792	11,255	13,209	15,293	18,453	22,175	26,551	29,884
75-79.....	1,597	1,985	2,399	2,734	3,258	3,702	4,173	4,725	5,647	6,481	7,439	8,727
80-84.....	303	384	444	577	708	844	1,003	1,207	1,376	1,643	1,861	2,092
85-89.....	36	48	55	67	78	107	125	143	188	229	274	324
90-94.....	4	4	3	3	4	4	5	6	7	8	12	14
95-99.....												
Total.....	4,041,017	4,007,798	3,970,194	3,931,029	3,890,105	3,847,205	3,802,111	3,752,600	3,700,491	3,645,531	3,587,462	3,526,029

Average age in 1940, 47.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to state to this Committee I signed the discharge petition that helped to bring H. R. 9000 to this floor, proposing to provide compensation benefits for the widows, children, and dependent parents of World War veterans without regard to the cause of the veterans' death or the requirement of the existence of a service-connected disability at the time of death.

I hope this proposed bill passes, as I do not think this country can do too much for our ex-service men's dependents. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I consider the bill before the Committee, H. R. 9000, as a just measure which should pass without opposition. The care of widows and orphans of our veterans is as much our patriotic obligation and duty as is the care of the veteran. I have always favored the legislation, I signed the petition, I worked for its earliest completion, and am now ready and anxious to vote. I have always supported veterans' legislation because I felt their demands were not unreasonable, and in this instance I am more certain than ever of the justice of the bill before the Committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROUTZOHN].

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, it was my privilege to support the bill which we now have under consideration. After listening attentively to the debate on the floor today, I have heard nothing presented that would cause me to change my opinion on this bill. I signed the petition which brought it out upon the floor of this House today. I am still heartily in favor of the bill and I hope and trust that my colleagues are of the same opinion and that the bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this legislation, and I want to announce at this time that my

colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TENEROWICZ], who is unavoidably absent today on account of public business, is very much in favor of the legislation, and if present here today would vote "yea."

It is my extreme pleasure to have supported this worthy piece of legislation for some time. I am not going to take up the time of the Committee with any further debate on this question, because I feel that the very able arguments of the gentlemen who have preceded me in favor of this bill are so convincing that it needs no further attention on my part. I feel certain the very overwhelming vote will be in favor of the veterans and their dependents. The service that they rendered this country in time of need deserves the relief that this bill will grant. It is only a logical development of the legislation to date with regard to widows' and orphans' pensions. We have reduced the requirements from a 20-percent disability to a 10-percent disability, and then in the last session of Congress we passed the bill authorizing pensions on the death of a veteran with any service-connected disability whatsoever. Therefore, this legislation is only fitting and proper at this time. It is my hope that it will finally become a law in this session of Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended, by adding a new paragraph, IV, thereto to read as follows:

"IV. (a) Subject to the income limitation of part III, paragraph II hereof, as amended, the surviving dependent widow as hereinafter defined, child, or children, and/or dependent mother or father of any deceased person who served in the active military or naval service during the World War, and whose service therein was as defined by part III, paragraph I hereof, as amended, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"Widow but no child, \$20; widow and one child, \$28; widow and two children, \$34 (with \$4 for each additional child); no widow but one child, \$12; no widow but two children, \$18 (equally divided); no widow but three children, \$24 (equally divided) (with \$3 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, \$20; or both, \$15 (each).

"(b) As to the widow, child, or children, the total compensation payable under this paragraph shall not exceed \$56. Where such benefits would otherwise exceed \$56, the amount of \$56 may be apportioned as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe."

SEC. 2. For the purpose of payment of compensation under the provisions of this act, the term "widow" shall mean a woman who was married prior to July 3, 1921, to the person who served; or who was married prior to May 13, 1938, to the person who served, provided a child was born of such marriage: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 13, 1938 (Public, No. 514, 75th Cong.), insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall govern the determination of eligibility of a widow for benefits under this act.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I must object to the request because there are some amendments to be offered to the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. The granting of this request will not prevent the offering of those amendments.

Mr. COSTELLO. If that is understood, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a natural and a logical course for Congress to take, and a natural and a logical follow-up, not only of legislation that has been passed of a similar nature relating to the widows and orphans of those who served in the Civil and the Spanish-American Wars, but a natural and logical follow-up of the legislation that we have already passed with reference to the widows and orphans of those who served in the World War.

You will recall that back a few years ago the only widow of a World War veteran who could receive a pension, and the only children who could receive such a pension, upon the death of a husband and father, were those whose husbands or fathers died with a direct service-connected disability, and the service-connected condition that they had at the time of the death had to be the cause of, or a contributing factor in the death of the husband or the father. A few years ago we passed a law providing that where 30-percent service-connected disability existed at the time of death, the death would be presumed to be connected with service for pension purposes to a widow and children. We passed that law because we recognized the practical situation that existed and the merits of the situation that confronted us. A year later we reduced that to 20 percent, and then, as I recall, we reduced it to 10 percent, and then, we later reduced it to apply to any veteran of the World War who, at the time of death, had a service-connected condition of 1 percent or more, and insofar as his death was concerned, for pension purposes for his widow and children, it was presumed to be connected with his service.

This is another step in the direction of giving consideration to the widows and children of World War veterans who have taken the journey "into the Great Beyond" and who were not service connected at the time of death. We are not only giving them the same consideration that we gave to the widows and children of Civil War and Spanish-American War veterans when a Congress of the past enacted the first pension law for widows and children of deceased veterans of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars, and it is only fair and it is only fitting and it is only proper that 23 years after the World War started this Congress should extend the same consideration to this deserving and worthy group, widows and children of veterans of the World War.

I respect my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], and I respect my friend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]. I have no controversy with them. In disagreement, I profoundly respect their views and their right to entertain the views that they do. There is no necessity for personal references in any controversial argument on this or any other legislation. We must respect and we should respect the views of all Members, even in disagreement. However, there was one statement made by my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] that I think he inadvertently made in extemporaneous debate; at least, I hope so.

The gentleman said that it is going to be hard to tell the people on relief, the widows who will be benefited by the passage of this law, that they are to be taken off of relief, and the gentleman wondered if they would appreciate being taken off of relief where they might be receiving \$40 or \$50 or \$60 a month and receive \$20 a month. The answer to that is that this bill will not do that. This does not take persons off relief. If anyone is entitled to from \$40 to \$60 relief, or to the soldiers' relief, certainly this \$20 will not take such a person off relief, but that amount will be deducted from the contribution made by the local government and to that extent it will be a relief to the local government at the expense of the Federal Government. As my time is about up I will conclude with the assertion that this bill should be enacted into law. [Applause.]

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I wish to speak a moment or two in regard to this bill. I suppose I occupy somewhat of a unique position in this House. Better than 42 years ago I was discharged honorably from the Army of the United States. I do not know how it happened, but up to this good hour I have never yet felt it proper to apply for a pension. I think these men and women and children who are included within the provisions of the bill are entitled to the consideration of the Congress. No man can render any greater service to his country than those boys did in 1917, 1918, and 1919. Their widows and children are certainly entitled to the same degree of protection from the Government as are those who participated in former wars. I know many very fine women in my district whose husbands have died as a result of service in that war that are not eligible for compensation under the Social Security Act, and it is well known that women are too often at a disadvantage to find employment in the ordinary commercial and industrial services, especially when there are children. This condition renders a peculiar hardship on the widows of World War veterans. It is not the proper thing to do to let them exhaust every kind of resources they have from which they can reasonably support a family or properly care for their children. The Government ought to look after these widows and children, and I think this bill is reasonable. The very fact that the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion and the Women's Auxiliaries of both these organizations are supporting the bill is a sufficient argument for Congress to pass it.

In addition to what has been said here, I think there is a greater argument perhaps for the passage of this law than any other argument that has been made in this debate, and that is this: The flames of the passions of war are now reaching higher than they have in years, probably since the World War. We ought to be very careful; we ought to be reminded and made conscious of the fact that war means the expenditure of billions of dollars.

Facing the world situation as we have to do, none of us can foretell what may be in store for this Nation in the way of sacrifice. I believe and hope that war with any foreign government can and will be avoided; but it is to the interest of every Member of Congress to say that if and when the young men of America are called on for service on the battlefield they can have the assurance of this Government that their widows and children will be taken care of by the Government. If they do not have this assurance, they would not surely as willingly take up arms as they might if they have that assurance. If the Government cannot give the men who may be called for future service this assurance, then we had better begin to do our thinking along the line that we had better not engage in any other war, for another war is going to probably take more billions of dollars to conduct it than the war we entered in 1917.

If we pass this bill—and this House is going to pass it, and ought to pass it—it should remind Congress that those of us who are always insisting on balancing the Budget should take a second thought before making up their minds to clamor for participation by this country in the troubles of Europe or Asia. There was never a time, in my judgment, when Congress ought to be more deliberate than now, as we are witnessing the great conflagration and wholesale slaughter and

destruction that is now engulfing Europe. No man can anticipate the staggering cost in men and money if we become involved in this present World War. As it is now, we may serenely look upon these great Government buildings on Capitol Hill and down the Mall, where law and order prevail and the people are fairly happy and secure in the enjoyment of peace. But if we get into that war, by the time we extricate ourselves from it the picture of America and of Washington may be decidedly different. We control it now; American blood and American thought dominate the country and give us that freedom of thought and action which to us now is mere commonplace. Engagement in another World War might change it all, and, instead of law and order ruling the day, it could be possible for us to witness groups of men being led in front of a wall to be shot down without trial, as is happening every day in all parts of Europe now.

Let us be careful about this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 2, line 8, after the words "equally divided", strike out the semicolon and the words "dependent mother or father, \$20, or both, \$15", and insert a period.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to eliminate the fathers and mothers from the provisions of this bill. I have heard a great deal here this afternoon about following precedents. Due to the fact that we have granted pensions to widows and dependent children of all the veterans of other wars, we are asked to follow this precedent and do the same thing for the veterans of the World War, but, as I have attempted to point out to you on previous occasions, it is very rare that any piece of veterans' legislation comes into this House strictly adhering to precedent. Almost without exception each bill brings in some new provision, creates some new inequality, and, as a result, we are forced then to pass additional legislation at a subsequent time in order to remove those inequalities. It is true that the parents of veterans of the Civil War are undoubtedly all dead and perhaps a majority of the parents of the veterans of the Spanish-American War are dead, but if there are any of them who are still alive I would not be at all surprised if the Committee on Pensions in the next Congress were to come in and demand equal treatment with the World War veterans, and ask that they, too, be given a pension because they are parents of the men who served in the Army of the United States when the Government was at war.

Remember, you are granting these pensions to every veteran who wore the uniform, and remember that many of them served possibly only 90 days, which is the minimum requirement. You are not asking for any service-connected disability. All you are asking is that they must have served 90 days, and that makes eligible for attention their widows and orphans, and now a new precedent, the parent. Four million seven hundred thousand men were mustered into the Army of the United States during the World War. We have had a great deal of discussion about the cost of this proposed legislation. If we eliminate the parents alone, we might save some eight and a half million dollars the first year. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] made the statement that the Veterans' Administration say that only about one-half of those eligible for this pension will apply. I correct his statement.

The Veterans' Administration states that only about half will apply during the first year. So perhaps the first year cost of this legislation may be cut down; but as soon as all those who are eligible do apply for the pensions that are provided under this bill, the full-year cost then will be \$48,000,000.

I have asked the Veterans' Administration to prepare some figures for me. Each year thereafter the cost is going to mount. Approximately 10,000 additional dependents will be added to the rolls annually. The result will be an added cost of approximately \$3,000,000 each year. Bringing the second

year in, the cost will be up to \$51,000,000; the third year, \$53,992,000; the fourth year, \$57,000,000; the fifth year, up to \$60,000,000.

You do not reach the expanding peak until the year 1968, and in that year it is quite likely that these figures may reach a trifling sum in excess of a cold billion dollars.

I submit herewith the figures which were prepared at my request by the Veterans' Administration, showing the annual cost of this legislation over a 5-year period:

Estimated 5-year cost, H. R. 9000, Seventy-sixth Congress

	Widow and children cases		Parent cases		Total estimated cost
	Estimated number cases	Estimated cost	Estimated number cases	Estimated cost	
First year.....	120,700	\$39,914,000	32,800	\$8,472,000	\$48,386,000
Second year.....	130,100	43,023,000	31,500	8,100,000	51,123,000
Third year.....	139,900	46,264,000	30,000	7,728,000	53,992,000
Fourth year.....	150,300	49,703,000	29,000	7,380,000	57,083,000
Fifth year.....	161,300	53,340,000	27,900	7,068,000	60,408,000

¹ One-half cost (\$19,957,000 for widows and children and \$4,236,000 for parents or a total of \$24,193,000) shown in the committee report was used, because it was assumed that not more than one-half of those entitled would apply and be paid the first year. Estimated peak year 1968.

I also wish again to call to the attention of the House the fact that the figures of the Veterans' Administration have only shown 1 percent of error over a period of years. Let me also say that very frequently the Veterans' Administration is called upon to submit the estimate of the cost of legislation while it is pending before a congressional committee. Consequently, the committee may amend the legislation prior to voting it out, and as a result the original figures submitted by the Veterans' Administration are not descriptive of the bill as reported from the committee. Too often, I believe, the Veterans' Administration is made the object of criticism without making allowances for these changes which take place in the legislation as a result of committee consideration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I decline to yield.

They say this bill will not cost much, but there are the figures of added cost year by year for the first 5 years. Just because we have a limitation on the marriage date and just because you have a limitation requiring dependency in this legislation, oh, the gentleman from Mississippi knows full well that they will not stay there very long. In the very next Congress you may be asked to remove the limitation as to date; to remove the limitation that a child must be born to the marriage. You may be asked to remove the limitation that they must show dependency. This legislation is only the starting point and every succeeding Congress, at least in election years, is going to have to do something to show the veterans that this Congress is just as anxious to serve the veterans and obtain their votes as was the preceding Congress. At least, gentleman, you do not have to expand the precedents in trying to follow them. You can at least eliminate the parents from this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

These old people, now 72 years old, in 1968 would be exactly 100 years old. We would have you believe there would be so many of them at that time that they would "bust" this Government. This is one diminishing group. In his State they receive \$40 a month now, but in other States they are not so fortunate.

Mr. COSTELLO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman does not want the orphans brought in.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the gentleman left the impression that they would be an increasing group in 1968, they would average 100 years old. By that time they would practically all be dead.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman knows I was referring to the orphans.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman was talking about his amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The Veterans' Administration told us that the average age in 1940, of all the mothers who will benefit by this bill will be 74.

Mr. RANKIN. Then they will be 102 years old in 1963.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And the average death is 77 out of every 1,000 annually. For the fathers their average age is 77, and the average death rate is 100 out of every 1,000 annually.

Mr. COSTELLO. Does the gentleman have the average age for the children?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, his figures are all wrong to start with. The maximum estimated here is about \$4,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: Page 2, at the end of line 14, after the word "prescribe", insert a new subsection designated as "C":

"For the purpose of payment of compensation under the provisions of this act, when persons are entitled to benefits under this act and under any other Federal act, including the Social Security Act, the greater benefit only is to be paid."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane, because it attempts to bring in the Social Security Act, and, therefore, it brings new matter into the bill. I think it is clearly not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut desire to be heard?

Mr. MILLER. Simply to state, Mr. Chairman, that that same language is used in veterans' legislation, except the phrase "other benefits" is used, because the reference was made before the enactment of the social-security law. That is simply a limitation on the money authorized in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOBBS). The Chair is ready to rule.

It seems to the Chair that this amendment is a limitation on the appropriation. The point of order is not sustained.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no illusions as to what will happen to the amendment and to the bill. A good deal has been said on the floor of the House recently in connection with another matter, a roll of honor. If the proponents of this legislation are as sure they are right as do some of the opponents, possibly we can establish such a roll here this afternoon.

It has been emphasized that this bill applies only to dependents, and it has been pointed out that the Veterans' Administration now states that a person receiving \$50 a month is not a dependent. I wondered the other day just what a World War veteran would receive if he were fortunate enough to be employed and earning \$35 a week and had been since the beginning of Social Security. I know that those who oppose me are going to say that a lot of veterans are not earning \$35 a week. In 1917 and 1918 when we sent these men to war they were acclaimed as the flower of American manhood. If that be true I say the majority of them are today earning over \$35 a week. In this connection I read a paragraph of a letter I received from the Social Security Board. I am sure these figures have been checked and that no member of the World War Veterans' Committee will dispute them. In writing to the Board I cited the hypothetical case of a man 45 years of age who died last January leaving a widow and two children, a man who had been employed at an average wage of \$35 a

week from the beginning of Social Security. I received this reply. I shall not read the entire letter but only this paragraph:

A surviving qualified child is entitled to a monthly benefit equal to one-half of the worker's primary benefit; a qualified widow receives an amount equal to three-fourths of her husband's benefit. You mention, as an example, the case of an individual who died in January of this year, and who is survived by a widow and two minor children. If this person was paid wages of \$35 for each week from the time the program went into effect until the quarter in which his death occurred, or an average monthly wage of \$151.67, his primary insurance benefit would be \$31.07, entitling each of his children to a monthly payment of \$15.53, and his widow to a monthly payment of \$23.30. A child may continue to receive monthly payments until it reaches age 16 or 18 if unmarried and still attending school. The widow's benefits stop when the youngest child reaches age 16 or 18, but since the worker in this case was fully insured at the time of his death, the widow may, upon reaching age 65, again receive widow's benefits, provided she has not remarried and is otherwise qualified.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I doubt if the gentleman's amendment would be necessary anyway, for under no circumstance can a veteran of the World War draw two pensions, social security and something else. He has got to choose which of the two he will accept.

Mr. MILLER. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will have no objection to my amendment. It cannot do any harm and may do some good. Let me cite an instance that might conceivably happen. Suppose my brother and I were killed in the same automobile accident. Assume that my brother did not happen to have served in the World War. We are both married and earning the same amount of money. Is there any justice in my widow's receiving social security plus the \$20 a month provided in this bill and my brother's widow not receiving the money provided in this bill but only that provided under social security?

A lot of argument has taken place in the House today, much of it not germane to the bill. Reference was made to the fact that men cannot prove service connection because of lost records. Past Congresses tried to correct that situation, and under the law as it stands today the Veterans' Administration will accept lay evidence. If those regulations are not adequate to make sure that every veteran is entitled to his service-connected disability, I am sure that the learned World War Veterans' Legislation Committee can and will bring in legislation that will extend those interpretations and those regulations. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the difficulty with the gentleman's amendment is that it discriminates against people on social security and takes from them a benefit they are entitled to for money they have paid in themselves. Furthermore, this bill provides that they must be dependent, and the Veterans' Administration has held this to mean earning not over \$50 a month. So one who is on social security would not be foreclosed unless he was making \$50 a month. An old person on social security under this amendment would be foreclosed out of proportion to the ones who are not on social security. They are earning what they get under social security. That is the genius of it. I submit, therefore, that this amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOBBS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9000) to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 444, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and ninety-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 247, noes 31.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference committee on the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a conference report thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CROSSER, is unavoidably absent from the city. If he had been present he would have voted for H. R. 9000, the widows and orphans bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a statement on my bill, H. R. 8206.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the Record.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter from Ruth Miller Steese, department legislative chairman of the American Legion Auxiliary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include some correspondence I have had with Senator SHEPPARD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after completion of the business in order for the day and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore made I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer on slum clearance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California, Mr. BUCK, was unavoidably detained this afternoon. Had he been present, he would have voted "aye" on H. R. 9000, the widows and orphans' bill.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BROOKS, was unavoidably detained this afternoon on account of official business. Had he been present, he would have voted "aye" on H. R. 9000.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. CASE, is unavoidably absent today, having gone to Louisiana to attend the Army's mass maneuvers and to inspect some of the new equipment as a member of the Appropriations subcommittee for the War Department. Had he been present, he would have voted for H. R. 9000, as he has consistently supported veterans' welfare legislation and was one of the first to sign the discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor of the House for action.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California, Mr. GEARHART, is absent today on account of illness. If he were present, he would have voted "aye" on H. R. 9000, the widows and orphans' bill just passed.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HARRINGTON, is unavoidably absent today. He asked me to announce that if he had been here he would have voted for the bill H. R. 9000.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during the sessions of the House while holding hearings on the bill S. 280.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an opinion of the Ninth United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of the National Labor Relations Board against the Sterling Electric Motor Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein a table of figures prepared by the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the appendix of the Record and include therein a copy of a radio address I delivered last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend in the Record the remarks I made earlier this afternoon in the Committee of the Whole and to

insert therein a speech I made in the House on November 2, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain tables on the bill H. R. 9000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MR. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news item from the Buffalo Courier-Express of today giving a report of the Army engineers concerning the port of Buffalo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE].

EXTENDING POWER OF BOARD OF EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9633) to enlarge and extend the power and jurisdiction of the Board of Education over degree-conferring institutions operating within the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Education shall be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to accredit junior colleges operating within the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That the entrance requirements of such junior colleges be not less than high-school graduation, and the number of semester-hours required for the title associate in arts or associate in science be not less than 60, and the number and character of the courses offered and the number and qualifications of the faculty be reasonable, and the institution be possessed of suitable classroom, laboratory, and library equipment.

That accreditation by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have the same force and effect as is usual in the case of accreditation by the various accrediting agencies of the several States of the Union.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will give the Board of Education authority and power to accredit junior colleges operating in the District and establishes the school department here on a basis similar to the department in the States. In short, it extends the existing authority of the Board over degree-conferring institutions to include the accrediting of junior colleges operating here. The Superintendent of Schools believes this legislation is necessary and will serve an existing educational need.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION TO ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL OF PERSONS IN VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9576) relating to the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of persons resident or domiciled in the Virgin Islands of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon the application of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to transfer to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia

for treatment (1) persons who are permanent residents of the Virgin Islands of the United States, who are citizens or nationals of the United States, and who have been legally adjudged to be insane in the Virgin Islands or while temporarily in another insular possession or a Territory of the United States or in the continental United States; and (2) persons who have been legally adjudged to be insane in the Virgin Islands, who are not permanent residents of the Virgin Islands, and who are American citizens whose legal residence in one of the States or Territories or the District of Columbia it has been impossible to establish. The expense of treatment and care may be paid from the appropriation for the support of the hospital.

Upon the ascertainment of the legal residence of American citizens who have been transferred to the hospital and who are not permanent residents of the Virgin Islands, the superintendent of the hospital shall transfer such persons to their respective places of residence, and the expenses of transfer shall be paid from the appropriation for the support of the hospital.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia of persons who reside in the Virgin Islands. In the Virgin Islands there is no mental hospital nor are there adequate facilities for the care of the mentally ill. Although provision is made for the hospital care of mentally ill citizens of Alaska, the Canal Zone, and even Americans residing in Canada, no provision has been made for the Virgin Islands, and hence this legislation appears necessary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 3251) to amend sections 16 and 17 of chapter II of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 16 and 17 of chapter II of the Act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. General deposit: Every company desiring to transact business in the District shall, as a prerequisite to the issuance of a certificate of authority, deposit, as herein provided, approved securities of not less than \$100,000 market value. In the case of domestic companies, such deposit shall be made in the District as prescribed under section 17 of this Act: *Provided,* That the deposit of every domestic company heretofore organized under the provisions of the laws of the District or other Act of Congress may, in the discretion of the Superintendent, be limited (1) for stock companies, to an amount equal to the capital stock outstanding at the date of approval of this Act; (2) for nonstock companies, to such amount as in the opinion of the Superintendent would be required from stock companies of comparable size. In no case shall the deposit of a domestic company be less than \$25,000 in value. In the case of foreign or alien companies, the deposit may be made as provided under section 17 of this Act, or may be made with the supervising official of any State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States authorized to accept such deposit, which shall be held for the benefit of all policyholders.

"In the case of a deposit made with an official outside the District, a certificate of deposit from said official shall be filed with the Superintendent, showing the character of the deposit, before a certificate of authority to transact business in the District may be issued, and, if the securities so deposited are not of the class authorized by this act for investments of companies the Superintendent may require an additional deposit in approved securities.

"SEC. 17. Holding of general deposits by District Auditor and Secretary to Board of Commissioners: When any company is required by this act to make a deposit in the District, such deposit shall be in securities of the class authorized by this act for investments of companies and shall be delivered by the company to the secretary of the Board of Commissioners of the District and the auditor of the District, who shall receive and hold the same subject to the lawful orders of the Superintendent, and who shall be responsible for the safekeeping of all securities deposited or delivered under the authority of this section. The company shall have the right to collect the income on deposited securities so long as it continues solvent and complies with the laws of the United States and of the District, and it shall have the right to substitute for such securities other securities, provided such substituted securities are of the character, amount, and value required by this section, and are approved by the Superintendent: *Provided,* That not less than

\$25,000 of such deposit shall at all times consist of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness of the United States or of any State of the United States, or of any county or incorporated city of any State of the United States, and that securities of a class different from such bonds or other evidences of indebtedness shall not in any case be accepted for deposit except with the specific approval of and at values determined by the Superintendent.

"If the value of securities deposited by any company shall decline, the Superintendent may require the company to make a further deposit, in order that the amount and value of the deposit required by this Act shall at all times be maintained."

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to clarify the present law. At the present time the deposit required may be made in securities of the class authorized for investment of companies, but there is no provision as to who shall have custody and control of such securities. Under the proposed bill every company must deposit at least \$25,000 in bonds or other evidence of indebtedness and all securities so deposited will be received and held by the secretary of the Board of Commissioners and the district auditor.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 10 OF CHAPTER 5 OF PUBLIC ACT NO. 436, RELATING TO LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9299) to amend section 10 of chapter 5 of Public Act No. 436, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 19, 1934, and ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of chapter 5 of Public Act No. 436, Seventy-third Congress, known as the Life Insurance Act, approved the 19th day of June 1934, be amended by changing the last period to a semicolon and inserting in parentheses the letter (e) and following with the language: "life insurance covering only the lives of members of a group of persons for not more than \$2,000 on any one life numbering not less than 100 new entrants to the group yearly who become borrowers from one lending institution, including subsidiary or affiliated companies, under agreement to repay the sum borrowed in installments or who become purchasers of securities, merchandise, or other property from one vendor under agreement to repay the sum borrowed or to pay the balance of the price of the securities, merchandise, or other property purchased in installments in either event to the extent of their indebtedness to said lending institution or vendor but not to exceed \$2,000 on any one life written under a policy which may be issued upon the application of and made payable to the lending institution or vendor or other creditor to whom such vendor may have transferred title to the indebtedness as beneficiary the premium on such policy to be payable by the borrower, lending institution, vendor, or other creditor"; and that paragraph 4 of section 11, of the same Life Insurance Act be amended by adding the following sentence at the end: "The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to insurance described in item (e) of section (10)."

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will permit life insurance companies to issue so-called creditor's group policies, whereby persons borrowing money from lending institutions will be covered for the amount of the loan for a period of time corresponding to the term of the loan. The purpose is to facilitate the insuring of individuals borrowing money and providing such insurance at the lowest possible cost. Similar legislation has been enacted in recent years in many of the States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF FIRE, MARINE, AND CASUALTY INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9722) to provide for the regulation of the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CHAPTER I—TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. Short title and table of contents: This act shall be known as the "Fire and Casualty Act".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

Section 1. Short title and table of contents.
Section 2. Application.
Section 3. Definitions.

Chapter II

Section 1. Records of Insurance Department; power to make rules.
Section 2. Certificate of authority.
Section 3. Revocation and suspension of certificate of authority.
Section 4. When company has ceased business.
Section 5. Receivership proceedings.
Section 6. When company to be deemed insolvent.
Section 7. When capital or surplus of company deemed impaired.
Section 8. Annual statement.
Section 9. Penalty for false statement.
Section 10. Examinations.
Section 11. Classification of insurance.
 (1) Fire and marine.
 (2) Casualty.
Section 12. Limitation of risk.
Section 13. Minimum capital and surplus requirement.
Section 14. Corporations heretofore formed.
Section 15. Domestic companies.
Section 16. Domestic company real-estate holdings.
Section 17. Mutual company's surplus fund—Power to borrow.
Section 18. Investment of funds of domestic companies.
Section 19. Exclusive agency contracts.
Section 20. Foreign or alien companies.
Section 21. Application for certificate of authority.
Section 22. Delivery to superintendent of application and documents.
Section 23. Service of process.
 (a) Service of process upon unauthorized company.
 (b) Attorney for services of process.
Section 24. Mutual and reciprocal names.
Section 25. Maximum and contingent premiums of mutual companies.
Section 26. Reserves.
Section 27. Policy forms filed with the superintendent.
Section 28. Provisions in accident and health policies.
Section 29. Discriminations prohibited.
Section 30. Agents and brokers—Requirements for license, etc.
Section 31. Payment of commissions restricted to licensed persons.
Section 32. Procedure for obtaining licenses.
Section 33. Effective dates of licenses and proration of fees.
Section 34. Temporary transfer of licenses.
Section 35. Renewal of licenses.
Section 36. Revocation and suspension of licenses.
Section 37. Unauthorized solicitation or representation.
Section 38. When license not required.
Section 39. Unauthorized insurance.
Section 40. Taxes paid by policyholder on premiums charged by unauthorized companies.
Section 41. Licenses for lines in unauthorized companies.
Section 42. License fees.
Section 43. Testimony; production of books.
Section 44. Penalties not otherwise prescribed.
Section 45. Appeal from superintendent to Commissioners.
Section 46. Court proceedings.
Section 47. Repeals.
Section 48. Constitutionality.
Section 49. Effective date of act.

Sec. 2. Application: All fire, marine, and casualty insurance companies now or hereafter incorporated or formed in the District, or authorized to do business in the District, all brokers and all agents and other representatives of such companies, shall, to the extent hereinafter provided, be subject to this act: *Provided*, That this act shall not affect the business of life and title insurance, and shall not affect the right or authority of any solvent company to make contracts of fidelity or surety.

Sec. 3. Definitions: In this act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"District" means District of Columbia.

"Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"Superintendent" means the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia.

"Department" means the Department of Insurance of the District of Columbia.

"Company" means an insurance, surety, or indemnity company, and shall be deemed to include a corporation, company, partnership, association, individual, or aggregation of individuals engaging in or proposing or attempting to engage in any kind of insurance, surety, or indemnity business, including the exchanging of reciprocal or interinsurance contracts between individuals, partnerships, and corporations.

"Authorized company" means a company which has authority from the Superintendent to do business in the District as provided under section 2, chapter II, of this act.

"Unauthorized company" means a company which does not have authority from the Superintendent to do business in the District as provided under section 2, chapter II, of this act.

"Domestic company" means a company incorporated or organized under the laws of the District.

"Foreign company" means a company incorporated or organized under the laws of any State of the United States.

"Alien company" means a company incorporated or organized under the laws of any country other than the United States.

"Reciprocal" includes interinsurance exchange.

"Person" includes individuals, corporations, associations, exchanges, and partnerships.

Personal pronouns include all genders; the singular includes the plural and the plural includes the singular.

"Policy" means an insurance policy or contract, including contracts of fidelity and surety, and includes any contract wherein one party called the "company", for a consideration, undertakes to pay money or its equivalent, or to do an act valuable to any other party upon the happening of the hazard or peril insured against whereby the party insured suffers loss or injury or is subjected to legal liability.

"Officer", when used to refer to officer of the company, includes an attorney-in-fact.

"Policy-writing agent" means any person who is not a salaried employee of a company, and whose residence or principal place of business is located in the District, and who is authorized in writing by any company authorized to transact business in the District to countersign policies and to solicit, negotiate, or effect contracts of insurance, surety, or indemnity for such company in the District.

"Soliciting agent" means any person who is not a salaried employee of a company, and whose residence or principal place of business is located in the District, and who is authorized by a company having authority to transact business in the District, or by a policy-writing agent, to solicit in the District contracts of insurance, surety, or indemnity in behalf of such company or agent.

"Broker" means any person who for a consideration acts or aids in any manner in the solicitation or negotiation on behalf of the assured of contracts of insurance, surety, or indemnity.

"Salaried company employee" means any person regularly employed by an authorized company, and who is paid a regular wage or salary to perform certain duties and functions authorized by such company. For the purposes of this act, the term "salaried company employee" shall not include employees engaged solely in office duties or in the inspection, rating, or classifying of risks or in the supervision of agents, or any employee not engaged in the solicitation or writing of policies, or officers of companies or associations engaged in the performance of their usual and customary executive duties.

"Surplus" means the excess of admitted assets over liabilities and capital in the case of a company with capital stock, and the excess of admitted assets over liabilities in the case of a company without capital stock.

"Liabilities" means all debts due or to become due, contingent or otherwise, of which the company has knowledge, and includes the reserves required by this act.

"Admitted assets" includes the investments authorized or permitted by this act, and, in addition thereto, only the following:

(1) Cash in a company's principal or branch offices or in possession of a company or in transit, and cash deposited with the officers of any State or subdivision thereof, or the Dominion of Canada, when such deposit is necessitated by the laws of such State or subdivision thereof, or by the laws of the Dominion of Canada.

(2) Cash deposited in sound banks and trust companies.

(3) The amount fairly estimated as recoverable on cash deposited in closed banks and trust companies.

(4) Bills and accounts receivable collateralized by securities of the kind in which the company is authorized to invest.

(5) Bills receivable not past due for risks taken by companies authorized to transact fire and marine business described in section 10 of chapter II of this act that are not in excess of the unearned premiums thereon.

(6) Gross premiums or premium deposits in course of collection not more than 90 days past due, less commissions due thereon to agents.

(7) Amounts fairly estimated as recoverable from advances made on contracts under surety bonds.

(8) Amounts due from solvent insurance companies, bureaus, or company associations, and amounts fairly estimated as recoverable from insolvent insurance companies.

(9) The interest accrued during the 12 months immediately preceding on mortgage loans other than those upon which the company is proceeding for the enforcement of security.

(10) The rents accrued on the company's property during the 12 months immediately preceding.

(11) Interest due and accrued on bonds conforming to this act and not in default.

(12) Amounts due and accrued on dividends declared on shares of stock conforming to this act.

(13) Interest due and accrued on collateral loans which is not in excess of the value of the collateral over the amount loaned thereon.

(14) Interest due and accrued on deposits in sound banks and trust companies.

(15) Interest accrued on tax-anticipation warrants.

(16) Amounts due for tax refunds allowed but unpaid from the United States or any State.

CHAPTER II—POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUPERINTENDENT

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. Records of Insurance Department; power to make rules: The office of the Superintendent shall be a public office, and the records, books, and papers thereof on file therein shall be public records of the District, except as the Superintendent for good reason may decide otherwise, or except as it may be provided otherwise herein.

The Superintendent shall have authority to make and enforce such reasonable rules and regulations as may be necessary in making effective the provisions of this act, but such rules and regulations shall not be contrary to nor inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

Sec. 2. Certificate of authority: It shall be the duty of the Superintendent to issue a certificate of authority to a company when it shall have complied with the requirements of the laws of the District so as to be entitled to do business therein. The Superintendent may, however, satisfy himself by such investigation as he may deem proper or necessary that such company is duly qualified under the laws of the District to transact business therein, and may refuse to issue or renew any such certificate to a company if the issuance of renewal of such certificate would adversely affect the public interest. In each case the certificate shall be issued under the seal of the Superintendent authorizing and empowering the company to transact the kind or kinds of business specified in the certificate, and each such certificate shall be made to expire on the 30th day of April next succeeding the date of its issuance. No company shall transact any business in or from the District until it shall have received a certificate of authority as authorized by this section, and no company shall transact any business not specified in such certificate of authority. No domestic mutual company shall transact any business in the District until it has bona fide applications for insurance covering not less than 200 separate risks in not less than 20 policies to be issued to not less than 20 members, and has received the cash premium therefor, and has a surplus of not less than the amount provided under sections 12 and 13 of chapter II of this act.

Sec. 3. Revocation and suspension of certificate of authority: The Superintendent shall have power to revoke or suspend the certificate of authority to transact business in the District of any company which has failed or refused to comply with any provision or requirement of this act, or which—

(a) Is impaired in capital or surplus;

(b) Is insolvent;

(c) Is in such a condition that its further transaction of business in the District would be hazardous to its policyholders or creditors in the District, or to the public;

(d) Has refused or neglected to pay a valid final judgment against such company within 30 days after such judgment shall have become final either by expiration without appeal within the time when such appeal might have been perfected, or by final affirmation on appeal;

(e) Has violated any law of the District or has in the District violated its charter or exceeded its corporate powers;

(f) Has refused to submit its books, papers, accounts, records, or affairs to the reasonable inspection or examination of the Superintendent, his deputies, or duly appointed examiners;

(g) Has an officer who has refused upon reasonable demand to be examined under oath touching its affairs;

(h) Fails to file with the Superintendent a copy of an amendment to its charter or articles of association within 30 days after the effective date of such amendment;

(i) Has had its corporate existence dissolved or its certificate of authority revoked in the State in which it was organized; or

(j) Has had all its risks reinsured in their entirety in another company, without prior approval of the Superintendent.

The Superintendent shall not revoke or suspend the certificate of authority of any company until he has given the company not less than 30 days' notice of the proposed revocation or suspension and of the grounds alleged therefor, and has afforded the company an opportunity for a full hearing: *Provided, however,* That if the Superintendent shall find upon examination that the further transaction of business by the company would be hazardous to the public or to the policyholders or creditors of the company in the District, he may suspend such authority without giving notice as herein required.

Sec. 4. When company has ceased business: If a company shall cease to do business in the District, it shall thereupon make report to the Superintendent of the taxable premiums collected which have not been reported prior to the date of the cessation of business, and shall forthwith pay to the collector of taxes of the District, through the Superintendent, a tax thereon computed according to law. If a company fails or refuses to make such a report or to pay the tax imposed upon it as required by law, it shall be liable to the District for the amount of such taxes, plus a penalty of 8 percent per month for each month or part thereof during which such taxes remain unpaid.

Sec. 5. Receivership proceedings: The Superintendent may, through the corporation counsel of the District, apply to the district court of the United States for the District for a rule directing any company organized under the laws of the District or any company in the course of organization to show why the Superintendent should not take possession of its property and conduct its business as the nature of the case and the interests of the policyholders, creditors, stockholders, or the public may require, whenever any such company is—

(a) Insolvent; or

(b) Has neglected or refused to observe a lawful order of the Superintendent to make good any deficiency in its capital or surplus; or

(c) Has by contract of reinsurance or otherwise transferred or attempted to transfer substantially its entire property or business, or has entered into any transaction, the effect of which is to merge substantially its entire property or business in the property or business of any other company, without having first obtained the written approval of the Superintendent; or

(d) Is found after an examination by the Superintendent to be in such condition that its further transaction of business would be hazardous to its policyholders; or

(e) Has violated its charter; or

(f) Is carrying on activities against public policy.

Upon such application, such court may, in its discretion, issue an injunction restraining such company from the transaction of its business or disposition of its property pending further order of the court. On the return of such rule to show cause, the court shall hear, try, and determine the issues forthwith, and shall either deny the application or direct the Superintendent to take possession of the property and conduct the business of such company and retain such possession and conduct such business until on the application either of the Superintendent, the corporation counsel representing him, or the company, it shall, after a like hearing, appear to the court that the ground for the order directing the Superintendent to take possession has been removed, and that the company can properly resume the possession of its property, and the conduct of its business. If on the like application and rule to show cause, and after a hearing, the court shall order the liquidation of the business of such company, such liquidation shall be made by and under the direction of the Superintendent, who may deal with the property and business of such company in his own name as Superintendent, or in the name of the company, as the court may direct, and shall be vested by operation of law with title to all of the property, contracts, and rights of action of such company as of the date of the order so directing him to liquidate. The filing or recording of such order in the office of the recorder of deeds for the District shall impart the same notice that a deed, bill of sale, or other evidence of title duly filed or recorded by such company would have imparted. For the purpose of this section, the Superintendent shall have power to appoint under his hand and official seal one or more special deputy superintendents, and to employ clerks and assistants as may by him be deemed necessary. The fair and reasonable compensation of such special deputies, clerks, and assistants, and all the expenses of taking possession of and conducting the business of any such company shall, subject to the approval of the court, be paid out of the funds or assets of such company. The court may require a corporate surety bond or bonds from the Superintendent in such amount as it may deem necessary.

Sec. 6. When company to be deemed insolvent: Any insurance company whose assets are not sufficient to reinsure its outstanding risks in a solvent insurance company shall be deemed insolvent, and may be proceeded against as provided in this act.

Sec. 7. When capital or surplus of company deemed impaired: Any company whose capital has been reduced to an amount less than that required by this act, or whose surplus of admitted assets in excess of all liabilities is less than the amount required by this act, shall be deemed to be impaired in capital or surplus, and may be proceeded against as provided in this act.

Sec. 8. Annual statement: Every company doing business in the District shall file with the Superintendent before March 1 in each year a financial statement for the year ending December 31 immediately preceding on forms furnished by the Superintendent. The Superintendent shall have authority to extend the time for filing such statement by any company for reasons which he shall deem good and sufficient. Such statement shall be verified by the oath of the president and secretary of the company, or, in their absence, by two other principal officers. The Superintendent shall annually in the month of December furnish to each of the companies authorized to do business in the District blanks necessary for the filing of the statement herein required. Such blanks shall conform substantially to the form of statement adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. The Superintendent shall have power to make such modifications and additions in said blank forms of statement as he may deem desirable and necessary to ascertain the condition and affairs of the company. The Superintendent shall also have power to require that at least once in the month of March in each year a summary of such annual statement shall be published by the company in a daily newspaper published in the District.

Sec. 9. Penalty for false statement: Any director, officer, agent, or employee of any company who subscribes to, makes, or concurs in making or publishing any annual or other statement required by law, knowing the same to contain any material statement which is false, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

Sec. 10. Examinations: The Superintendent may examine the books, paper, property, and affairs of any agent or company organized or doing business in the District, and of any company engaged in or professing to be engaged in organizing, promoting, or soliciting stock or capital contributions to or aiding in the formation of any company, or any company which holds the capital stock of another company for the purpose of controlling the management thereof as voting trustee or otherwise. The Superintendent, his deputy, or any examiner designated by the Superintendent, may examine under oath the officers and agents of such company, and all persons

deemed to have material information regarding the company's property or business. Every such company, its officers, and agents shall produce at the home office of the company at the time designated by the Superintendent its books of original entry, and all records and papers in its or their possession relating to its or their business or affairs. The officers and agents of such company shall facilitate such examination insofar as it is in their power to do so. The expense of such examination shall be paid by the company examined. Any officer, director, agent, or employee of any company who makes or causes to be made any false entry in any book, report, or statement of such company with intent to injure or defraud such company or any other company or person, or to deceive any officer of such company, or the Superintendent, and any person who with like intent aids or abets any officer, director, agent, or employee in any violation of this act shall be fined not more than \$1,000, or shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. The Superintendent may, in lieu of such examination of a foreign or alien company, accept the report on the examination of such company made by the Insurance Department or other insurance supervising official in any other State or any government outside the United States.

Sec. 11. Classification of insurance: Any company authorized to do business in the District may, when empowered by its charter, make all or any one or more of the kinds of insurance and reinsurance comprised in either or both of the following classes, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of this act:

(1) Fire and marine: On houses, buildings, and all other kinds of property against loss, damage, or damages by fire, lightning, or storm; to insure against loss or damage by water to any goods or premises arising from the breakage or leakage of sprinkling or water pipes; and to make all kinds of insurance against loss of or damage to goods, merchandise, or other property caused by fire, risks of transportation, or navigation, the action of the elements or adverse manifestations of nature, as well as all and every risk or peril to which the subject of insurance may be exposed, against which it is not contrary to public policy to insure, including every insurable interest therein or in the use thereof, or profit or income therefrom, or legal liability therefor, but not to include injury to the person nor loss caused by breach of trust.

(2) Casualty: (a) Upon the health of persons, or against injury, disablement, or death of persons resulting from traveling or general accidents by land or water, and against liability of the assured for injuries to employees or other persons; (b) upon the lives of domestic animals; (c) upon plate glass against breakage; (d) upon boilers against explosions, and against loss or damage to life or property resulting therefrom, and against loss or damage resulting from the breakage of machinery; (e) against loss by burglary or theft, or both; (f) to guarantee and indemnify merchants, traders, and those engaged in business and giving credit, from loss and damage by reason of giving and extending credit to their customers and those dealing with them; (g) to insure against any other casualty risk which may lawfully be the subject of insurance, and which it is not contrary to public policy to insure: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed as having any effect whatever upon the right or authority of any solvent company to make contracts of fidelity or surety.

Sec. 12. Limitation of risk: No company other than a mutual or reciprocal company doing business in the District shall expose itself to any loss on any one risk or hazard in the District to an amount exceeding 10 percent of the sum of its capital stock and surplus without the written prior consent of the Superintendent. No mutual or reciprocal company shall expose itself to any loss on any one risk or hazard in the District to an amount exceeding 10 percent of its surplus without written prior consent of the Superintendent. No portion of any such risk or hazard which shall have been reinsured in a company authorized to do business in the District shall be included in determining limitation of risk: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to the insurance of workmen's compensation, employers' liability, marine, or inland marine risks.

Sec. 13. Minimum capital and surplus requirement: Every stock company authorized to do business in the District shall have and shall at all times maintain a paid-up capital stock of not less than \$150,000, and a surplus of not less than \$150,000. Every domestic mutual company and every domestic reciprocal company shall have and shall at all times maintain a surplus of not less than \$150,000, and every foreign or alien mutual company and every foreign or alien reciprocal company shall have and shall at all times maintain a surplus of not less than \$200,000.

Sec. 14. Corporations heretofore formed: No company shall be exempt from the provisions of this act by reason of its having been incorporated in the District or elsewhere prior to the effective date of this act, except that, in the case of companies authorized in the District on the date of approval of this act, and continuously authorized thereafter without any increase of authority, the minimum capital and surplus required of a stock company, and the minimum surplus required of a mutual or reciprocal company by the laws of the District heretofore applicable shall not be increased by this act, and provided also that in the case of such continuously authorized companies the provisions of section 24 relating to the names of companies, and the provisions of section 25 relating to the amount of surplus necessary to the issuance of policies having no provision for contingent liability, shall not be applicable.

Sec. 15. Domestic companies: Any domestic stock, mutual, or reciprocal company desiring to transact business in the District shall, after complying with the general laws of the District governing the formation of companies or corporations, file with the Superintendent copies of its articles of incorporation, bylaws, charter, proposed forms of policies, and such other information as may be neces-

sary to manifest and explain the organization, objects, and purposes of the company, and to satisfy the Superintendent that such company has complied with the laws of the District regarding the formation of companies. Thereafter, upon application made to the Superintendent upon such forms as the Superintendent shall prescribe, the Superintendent, subject to the provisions of chapter II, section 2, of this act, shall issue to the company a certificate of authority to transact business in the District.

Sec. 16. Domestic company real estate holdings: A domestic company may acquire, hold, and convey real estate for the purpose and in the manner only following:

(1) The building in which it has its principal office and the land on which it stands.

(2) Such as shall be requisite for its convenient accommodation in the transaction of its business.

(3) Such as shall have been acquired for the accommodation of its business.

(4) Such as shall have been mortgaged to it in good faith by way of security for loans previously contracted or for money due.

(5) Such as shall have been conveyed to it in satisfaction of debts, previously contracted, in the course of its dealings.

(6) Such as it shall have purchased at sales on judgments, decrees, or mortgages obtained or made for such debts.

All such real estate specified in paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this section, which shall not be necessary for its accommodation in the convenient transaction of its business, shall be sold by the company and disposed of within 5 years after it shall have acquired the title to the same, or within 5 years after the same shall have ceased to be necessary for the accommodation of its business, unless the company procure the certificate of the Superintendent that its interests will suffer materially by a forced sale thereof, in which event the time for the sale may be extended to such time as the Superintendent shall direct in such certificate.

Sec. 17. Mutual company's surplus fund—Power to borrow: A domestic mutual company may borrow or assume liability for the repayment of a sum of money sufficient to defray the reasonable expenses of its organization or to enable it to comply with any requirement of law or as a surplus fund upon agreement which shall first be submitted to and approved by the Superintendent that such loan or advance with interest at a rate not exceeding 6 percent per annum shall be repaid only with the approval of the Superintendent whenever in his judgment the company shall be in possession of sufficient surplus in excess of a surplus equal to the amount required by this act. Any such loan or advance shall not form a part of the legal liabilities of the company, but until such loan or advance has been repaid all statements published by such company or filed with the Superintendent shall show the amount thereof then remaining unpaid.

Sec. 18. Investment of funds of domestic companies: A domestic company shall invest its funds only in—

(1) Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness of the United States, or of any State; or of the Dominion of Canada, or of any Province thereof.

(2) Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness of any county, city, town, village, school district, or other municipal district within the United States or the Dominion of Canada which shall be a direct obligation of the county, city, town, village, or district issuing the same.

(3) Bonds or notes secured by mortgages or deeds of trust on unencumbered real estate or perpetual leases thereon in the United States or Dominion of Canada worth not less than 50 percent more than the amount loaned thereon. Where improvements on the land constitute a part of the value on which the loan is made, the improvements shall be insured against fire for the benefit of the mortgage in an amount not less than the difference between two-thirds of the value of the land and the amount of the loan: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section real estate shall not be deemed to be encumbered within the meaning of this section by reason of the existence of taxes or assessments that are not delinquent, instruments creating or reserving mineral, oil, or timber rights, rights-of-way, joint driveways, sewer rights, rights in walls, nor by reason of building restrictions or other restrictive covenants, nor when such real estate is subject to lease in whole or in part whereby rents or profits are reserved to the owner.

(4) Bonds or notes secured by mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administrator: *Provided*, That the restrictions in subparagraph (3) of this section in regard to the ratio of the loan to the value of the property shall not apply to such insured mortgages.

(5) Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness of the farm-loan banks authorized under the Federal Farm Loan Act, or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and bonds or other evidences of indebtedness of national mortgage associations.

(6) Stock or bonds and other evidences of indebtedness of any solvent corporation of any State or Territory of the United States or of the District or of any Province of the Dominion of Canada, excepting stock in its own corporation: *Provided*, That no such investment shall be made in or loan made upon the security of any such stocks upon which dividends in cash during the period of 5 years next preceding such purchase in each fiscal year for said 5 years shall not have been paid, and upon which bonds any regular interest payment shall have been defaulted any time within 5 years prior to such purchase or loan.

(7) Loans upon the pledge of any of the securities aforesaid.

(8) A company doing business in a foreign country may invest the funds required to meet its obligations in such country and in conformity to the laws thereof in the same kind of securities in such foreign country that such company is allowed by law to invest in the United States.

(9) The bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, a corporation organized under and pursuant to the authority of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, passed by the Congress of the United States and approved June 13, 1933.

No loan or investment shall be made by any such company, unless the same shall have been authorized by the board of directors or by a committee thereof charged with the duty of supervising loans or investments.

No such company shall subscribe to or participate in any underwriting of the purchase or sale of securities or property, or enter into any transaction for such purchase or sale on account of said company, jointly with any other corporation, firm, or person, or enter into any agreement to withhold from sale any of its securities or property; but the disposition of its assets shall at all times be within the control of the company.

Nothing in this act shall prohibit a company from accepting in good faith, to protect its interest, securities, or property, other than herein referred to, in payment of or to secure debts due or to become due the company.

Sec. 19. Exclusive agency contracts: No domestic company authorized to do an insurance business in the District shall have or make any contract with any person whereby such person is granted the exclusive right or privilege to solicit, procure, write, produce, or manage the entire insurance business of such company, or to collect premiums therefor, unless such contract is filed with and approved in writing by the Superintendent. The Superintendent shall not approve any such contract which—

(a) Subjects the company to excessive charges for expenses or commissions; or

(b) Gives to such person the right to manage any of the affairs of such company or the exclusive right to solicit, procure, write, or produce the entire insurance business for such company, or to collect the premiums therefor for such unreasonable period as may jeopardize the interests or security of the company's policyholders.

Sec. 20. Foreign or alien companies: Upon complying with the provisions of this act, a foreign or alien company organized as a stock, mutual, or reciprocal company, but not otherwise, may be authorized by certificate of authority to transact in the District the kind or kinds of business which a domestic company similarly organized may be authorized to transact under this act. Such certificate of authority shall be issued as provided under section 2, chapter II, of this act.

Sec. 21. Application for certificate of authority: A foreign or alien company, in order to procure a certificate of authority to transact business in the District, shall make application therefor to the Superintendent on forms prescribed and furnished by the Superintendent. Such forms shall be executed for the company, by its president or vice president, or executive officer corresponding thereto, and verified by such officer, and, if a corporation, the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or other proper officer.

Sec. 22. Delivery to Superintendent of applications and documents: A foreign or alien company shall deliver to the Superintendent (a) application of the company for a certificate of authority; (b) a copy of its articles of incorporation or articles of association and amendments thereto, duly certified by the proper officer of the State or country under whose laws the company is organized or incorporated, or if reciprocal, the power of attorney of the attorney in fact; (c) if an alien company, a copy of the appointment and authority of its United States manager, certified by a proper officer of the company; (d) a copy of its bylaws and regulations; (e) forms of contracts and policies it proposes to issue in the District, and forms of the applications therefor, if any; (f) the instrument authorizing service of process on the Superintendent required by section 23 (b) of chapter II of this act; (g) a statement of its financial condition and business as of the end of the preceding calendar year, complying as to form and verification with the requirements of this act for annual statements, or financial statement as of such later date as the Superintendent may require; (h) a copy of the last report of examination, certified to by an insurance commissioner or other proper supervisory official; (i) a certificate from the proper official of the State or country wherein it is incorporated or organized, that it is duly incorporated or organized and is authorized to write the kind or kinds of insurance which it proposes to write in the District. Before a certificate of authority to transact business in the District is issued to a foreign or alien company, such company shall satisfy the Superintendent that (a) the company is duly organized under the laws of the State or country under whose laws it professes to be organized and is authorized to do the business it is transacting or proposes to transact; (b) its name is not the same as, or so deceptively similar to, the name of any domestic company, or the name of any department of the Federal Government or existing corporation authorized to transact business in the District as to mislead the public or cause confusion; (c) if a stock company, it has a paid-up capital and surplus at least equal to the capital and surplus required by this act, or, if a mutual company or reciprocal, it has a surplus and provision for contingent liability of policyholders at least equal to the surplus and provision for contingent liability of policyholders required by this act; (d) its funds are invested in accordance with the laws of its domicile, and in securities or property which afford a degree of financial security substantially equal to that required for similar domestic companies. Before issuing a certificate of authority to a foreign or alien company, the Superintendent may cause an examination to be made of the condition and affairs of such company.

Sec. 23. (a) Service of process upon unauthorized company: (1) The issuance or delivery of a policy or contract of insurance

in this District, to a citizen or resident thereof, by a foreign or alien company transacting business in this District without a certificate of authority, shall be deemed equivalent to an appointment by such company of the Superintendent and his successor or successors in office to be its true and lawful attorney upon whom may be served all lawful process in any action or proceeding against it, arising out of such policy or contract of insurance, and said issuance or delivery shall be a signification of its agreement that any such process against it which is so served shall be of the same legal force and validity as if served upon the company.

(2) Service of such process upon the Superintendent, and the responsibility of the Superintendent in regard thereto, shall be in accordance with the provisions for service of process upon authorized companies as provided in subsection (b).

(b) Attorney for services of process: Every foreign or alien company now or hereafter authorized to transact business in the District shall file with the Superintendent a duly executed instrument appointing and constituting him and his successors true and lawful attorney for such company, upon whom all lawful process in any action or legal proceeding against it in the District may be served, and therein shall agree that any lawful process against it, which may be served upon its said attorney as herein provided, shall be of the same force and validity as if served upon the company, and that the authority thereof shall continue in force irrevocably so long as any liability of the company in the District shall remain outstanding. Such process shall be served by delivering to and leaving the same with the Superintendent or his deputy, and service thereof upon such attorney shall be deemed service upon the company. The Superintendent shall forthwith forward such process by prepaid registered mail to the company, or, in the case of an alien company, to the United States manager or last appointed United States general agent of the company. The registry receipt evidencing the deposit by the Superintendent, or his deputy, of such process, in the United States mails in the manner herein prescribed, shall be prima facie evidence of the completion of such service. Failure of any such company to file such an instrument, or failure on the part of any such company to authorize such filing, shall not invalidate any service made by serving the Superintendent. By accepting a certificate of authority to transact business in the District, every such company shall be held to have appointed the Superintendent its true and lawful attorney. Any such company transacting business in the District without designating an attorney for service of process as herein provided shall, upon information filed by the corporation counsel of the District in the police court of the District, be fined upon conviction not less than \$10 nor more than \$500 for each day during which the company shall have operated in violation of this section.

Sec. 24. Mutual and reciprocal names: Except as otherwise provided in section 14, no mutual company shall be authorized to transact business in the District unless the name of such company shall include the word "mutual," and no reciprocal or interinsurance exchange shall be authorized to transact business in the District unless the name or designation under which reciprocal or interinsurance contracts are to be exchanged shall include the words "reciprocal" or "interinsurance exchange," or be supplemented by the following words immediately below the name or designation under which such contracts are exchanged: "A reciprocal" or "an interinsurance exchange."

Sec. 25. Maximum and contingent premiums of mutual companies: The maximum premium shall be expressed in the policy of a mutual company, and it may be solely a cash premium, or may be a cash premium and an additional contingent premium, which contingent premium shall be not less than the cash premium, but no mutual company, except as otherwise provided in section 14, shall issue any policy for a cash premium without an additional contingent premium until and unless it possesses a surplus of not less than \$300,000.

Sec. 26. Reserves: In determining the financial condition of companies authorized under this act, allowance shall be made for proper and adequate reserves for liabilities, including reserves for—

- (a) Unpaid losses and the expenses of the adjustment thereof.
- (b) Unearned premiums.
- (c) Commissions, taxes, and all other legal obligations, contingent or otherwise, of which the company has knowledge.

The computation of such reserves shall be in accordance with the provisions of the form of annual statement required under section 8 of chapter II of this act, and every authorized company shall maintain such reserves at all times.

Sec. 27. Policy forms filed with the Superintendent: The Superintendent may require that all policy forms used by every authorized company covering risks in the District be filed with the Superintendent. The Superintendent shall have authority to disapprove the use in the District of any policy form which in his opinion is illegal, inequitable, or contrary to public interests.

Sec. 28. Provisions in accident and health policies: The Superintendent may require that the provisions and conditions contained in any policy of insurance against loss or damage from sickness or bodily injury or death of the insured by accident issued by any company authorized by this act to transact business in the District be made to conform to the requirements prescribed under section 12 of chapter V of Public Law No. 436, Seventy-third Congress.

Sec. 29. Discriminations prohibited: Discrimination between individual risks of the same class or hazard in the amount of premiums or rates charged for any policy, or in the benefits or amount of insurance payable thereon, or in any of the terms or

conditions of such policy, or in any other manner whatsoever, is prohibited, and the Superintendent is empowered after investigation to order removed at such time and in such manner as he shall specify any such discrimination which his investigation may reveal.

Sec. 30. Agents and brokers—Requirements for license, and so forth: No company authorized to do business in the District shall, by its representatives or otherwise, make, write, issue, or deliver any contract of insurance, surety, or indemnity, except life, title, and ocean-marine insurance, on any person, property, business activity, or insurable interest within the District except through regularly constituted policy-writing agents or authorized salaried employees licensed in the District as provided in this act.

No such contract covering persons, property, business activities, or insurable interests in the District, except contracts of life, title, and ocean-marine insurance, shall be written, issued, or delivered by any authorized company or by any of its representatives unless such contract is duly countersigned in writing by a person who is licensed as provided in this act to countersign such contracts, and no salaried officer, manager, or other salaried employee of any authorized company, unless he be licensed as provided in this act, shall write, issue, or countersign any such contract.

No company, agent, or salaried company employee shall make any agreement as to a policy other than that which is plainly expressed in the policy issued.

No company, agent, salaried company employee, or broker shall pay or offer to pay or allow as an inducement to any person to insure any rebate of premium or any special favor or advantage whatever in the dividends to accrue thereon, or any inducement whatever not specified in the policy.

Every company authorized by this act to do business in the District shall file annually with the Superintendent on or before the 15th day of April, and at such other times as they may be appointed, a list of agents and salaried employees of said company who are authorized to solicit, write, effect, issue, or deliver policies for such company in the District, except that the names of soliciting agents may be filed either by the company or by the policy-writing agent.

Any policy-writing agent or salaried company employee authorized by any company to solicit, negotiate, bind, write, or issue policies or applications therefor shall, in any controversy between the insured or his representative and the said company, be held to be the agent of the company which issued or effected the policy solicited or so applied for, anything in the application or policy to the contrary notwithstanding.

Any payment made by or on behalf of the insured to any broker for policies issued to such broker for delivery to the insured or issued directly to the insured on the order of such broker, shall, in controversies between the insured and the company, be deemed to have been paid to the company.

No soliciting agent shall have any authority to countersign any policy.

Sec. 31. Payment of commissions restricted to licensed persons: No company, policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried employee shall pay any money or commission or brokerage or give or allow any valuable consideration to any person for or because of service in the District in negotiating or effecting a policy on any person, property, business activity, or insurable interest in the District, unless said person is duly licensed in conformity with this act as a broker or as an agent or salaried employee of the company issuing the policy. This section shall not apply to contracts of reinsurance, and shall not apply to persons and kinds of insurance exempted under section 38 of this act.

Sec. 32. Procedure for obtaining license: Any person hereafter desiring to engage in business in the District as a policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee, as defined by this act, shall, before engaging in such business, secure from the Superintendent a license authorizing him to engage in such business. The person to whom the license may be issued shall file sworn answers to such interrogatories as the Superintendent may require on forms furnished by the Superintendent. Before the Superintendent shall issue a license to any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, or salaried company employee he shall require the company or policy-writing agent desiring the appointment of such person to certify—

(a) That the person to be appointed, if not a salaried company employee, is a resident of this District, or that his principal office for the conduct of such business is in or will be maintained in the District;

(b) That he is personally known to the person making the certification;

(c) That he has had experience or instructions necessary to the proper conduct of the kind or kinds of business to which the license is to extend;

(d) That he has a good business reputation, is trustworthy, and is worthy of a license.

Resident and nonresident brokers shall, as a prerequisite to the issuance of a license, file with the Superintendent a corporate surety bond in an amount not less than \$5,000 for the benefit of any person who may suffer loss resulting from fraud or dishonesty on the part of said resident or nonresident broker. Before the Superintendent shall issue a license to any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, salaried company employee, or resident broker he shall personally, or through his deputy or any person regularly employed in the Department, within a reasonable time, and in a designated place within the District, subject each such person to a personal written examination relating to such person's knowl-

edge of the kind or kinds of business to which the license may extend and his competency to act as such policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee. The Superintendent may in his discretion limit the scope of such examination to such particular kind or kinds of business in which the person to be licensed is to be principally engaged. Following such examination the Superintendent shall issue such license as may be applied for when he is satisfied that the person to be licensed is (a) competent and trustworthy and intends to act in good faith in the capacity involved by the license applied for, and that not more than 25 percent of his commission income from business to which the license applies will result from policies the premiums on which are paid or are to be paid in the manner set forth in paragraph (f) of section 36; and (b) that he has a good business reputation and has had experience, training, or education, or is otherwise qualified in the line or lines of business in which the license would entitle him to engage, and, except in the case of a non-resident broker or salaried company employee, is a resident of the District, or maintains his principal office for the conduct of such business in the District; and (c) is reasonably familiar with the insurance laws of the District, and with the provisions, terms, and conditions of the policies he is proposing to solicit, negotiate, or effect, and is worthy of a license. In the case of a nonresident applying for a broker's license, the Superintendent may waive the examination requirement and accept in lieu thereof evidence that the applicant holds a license as broker or agent in the State where his principal business is conducted. The Superintendent may also waive the examination requirement in the case of any person who has been licensed in the District prior to the effective date of this act. Licenses may be issued in the names of individuals, or in the names of firms, partnerships, or corporations, including banks, trust companies, real-estate offices, and building and loan associations: *Provided*, That on such licenses there shall be listed the name of every member or officer of such firm, partnership, or corporation who solicits insurance or who countersigns policies: *And provided further*, That such named persons shall be subject to all requirements of this act, and that no officer or employee of such organizations other than those specifically named in such license shall be required to comply with this section, unless the duties of such officers or employees include soliciting or the countersigning of policies. No person shall be licensed as agent, broker, or salaried company employee when it appears to the Superintendent that said license is sought primarily for the purpose of obtaining commissions on policies on which he on his own account pays or is to pay the premiums, or on which the premiums are paid or are to be paid by any person who receives or is to receive any benefit, direct or indirect, from the commissions obtained, or on which the premiums are paid or are to be paid by any partnership, association, or corporation of which he is a member.

Sec. 33. Effective dates of licenses and proration of fees: All licenses issued under this act shall date from the first of the month in which the application for license is made, and shall expire on the 30th day of April next succeeding, and payment of the fees for such licenses shall be prorated accordingly.

Sec. 34. Temporary transfer of licenses: In the event of the death or disability of any person licensed as a policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, or salaried company employee, the Superintendent may transfer such license to another person without the payment of an additional fee, and may renew such license: *Provided, however*, That no person shall act as a policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, or salaried company employee under any transferred license or renewal thereof for a period in excess of 6 consecutive months.

Sec. 35. Renewal of licenses: Renewal of all expiring licenses shall be issued by the Superintendent upon application in writing by the applicant for any such license, subject to the conditions of section 36, and subject also to the provisions for examinations as set forth in section 32, upon payment of the applicable fee prescribed in section 42.

Sec. 36. Revocation and suspension of licenses: The Superintendent may revoke, suspend, or refuse to renew the license of any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee when and if, after investigation, it appears conclusively to the Superintendent that any license issued to such person was obtained by fraud or misrepresentation, or that such person has—

(a) Violated any of the provisions of the insurance laws of the District; or

(b) Has failed within a reasonable time to remit to any company all moneys which he has collected, and to which the company is entitled; or

(c) Has been guilty of rebating or has misrepresented the provisions of the policies which he is selling, or the policies of other companies; or

(d) Has countersigned policies in blank; or that

(e) More than 25 percent of his commission income from business to which the license applies results from policies the premiums on which are paid or are to be paid in the manner set forth in paragraph (f) of this section; or that

(f) Said license is being used primarily for the purpose of obtaining commissions on policies on which he, on his own account, pays or is to pay the premiums, or on which the premiums are paid or are to be paid by any person who receives or is to receive any benefit, direct or indirect, from the commissions obtained, or on which the premiums are paid or are to be paid by any partnership, association, or corporation of which he is a member.

Before the Superintendent shall revoke or suspend the license of any such person he shall give to such person an opportunity to be fully heard, and to introduce evidence in his behalf.

Sec. 37. Unauthorized solicitation or representation: It shall be unlawful for any person, without conforming to the provisions of this act, directly or indirectly to represent himself as having authority to solicit, negotiate, effect, procure, receive, or forward directly or indirectly any policy or renewal thereof, or to attempt to effect insurance, surety, or indemnity contracts covering any person or insurable interest in the District, or to countersign any policy or renewal thereof.

Sec. 38. When license not required: The provisions of this act relating to the licensing of policy-writing agents, soliciting agents, salaried company employees, and brokers shall not apply to the sale of personal accident insurance in the ticket offices of railroad companies or other common carriers, or in the offices of travel bureaus, nor to the business of life insurance, fraternal-benefit societies, or ocean marine insurance, nor to insurance covering the property of railroad companies and other common carriers engaged in interstate commerce.

Sec. 39. Unauthorized insurance: Except as provided in section 41 of this act, no person shall act as agent in the District for any company which is not authorized to do business in the District, nor shall any person directly or indirectly negotiate for or solicit applications for policies of, or for membership in, any company which is not authorized to do business in the District. The term "company" as used in this section shall include any association, society, company, corporation, joint-stock company, individual, partnership, trustee, or receiver engaged in the business of assuming risks of insurance, surety, or indemnity, and any Lloyd's organization, assessment, or cooperative fire company, or any reciprocal or interinsurance exchange, fraternal beneficial association, order, or society, and any company, association, or society, whether organized for profit or not, conducting a business, including any of the principles or features of insurance, surety, or indemnity. Any person who violates any provision of this section upon conviction shall be fined not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000 for each offense, or be imprisoned for not more than 12 months, or both, and any such person shall be personally liable to any resident of the District having claim against any such unauthorized company under any policy which said person has solicited or negotiated, or has aided in soliciting or negotiating: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who negotiates with an unauthorized company for life insurance, or for policies covering his own property or interests, nor shall the provisions of this section apply to the officers, agents, or representatives of any company which is in process of organization under the laws of the District, and which is authorized temporarily to solicit or secure memberships or applications for policies for the purpose of completing such organization. Prosecutions for violations of this section shall be upon information filed in the police court by the corporation counsel or any of his assistants.

Sec. 40. Taxes paid by policyholder on premiums charged by unauthorized companies: Except as provided in section 41 of this act, and in lieu of taxes avoided, there is hereby levied and assessed a tax of 50 cents on each dollar or fractional part thereof of the premium hereafter charged by any unauthorized company for the making, renewal, continuation, or reinstatement of each policy covering any person, property, or insurable interests within the District, when such policy is executed within or requires any act of performance in the District, and is issued to or for or in the name of or for the account of any person who does business in or who resides in the District: *Provided, however*, That marine or transportation insurance upon property while the same is in the course of exportation from or importation into the District or upon vessels or craft engaged in interstate or foreign trade or commerce shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this section: *And provided further*, That premiums for reinsurance and premiums for policies of life insurance shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this section. Every such person to or for or in the name of or for the account of whom any such policy shall hereafter be issued, renewed, continued, or reinstated shall withhold from each premium becoming due thereon after this act becomes effective the amount of tax hereby imposed, and pay the same to the collector of taxes for the District through the Superintendent within 10 days from the time such premiums become due. Every such person hereby required to withhold and pay such tax is hereby made liable for such tax, and in case he willfully fails to withhold or truthfully account for and pay the same as herein provided, shall pay in addition to the amount of such tax a sum equal to 5 percent thereof, and 1 percent additional for each month the tax remains unpaid, which sum shall be added to the tax and paid or collected therewith.

Sec. 41. Licenses for lines in unauthorized companies: Any agent or broker licensed in the District may, upon payment of a license fee, as provided under section 42, be licensed to procure policies from companies which are not authorized to do business in the District where such person is, after diligent effort, unable to procure policies to cover the kind or kinds of business required from companies duly authorized to transact business in the District. Each agent or broker so licensed shall pay to the collector of taxes, through the Superintendent, on February 1 and August 1 of each year, a sum equal to 2 percent of the amount of the gross premiums upon all kinds of policies procured by him during the immediately preceding 6 months' period ending December 31 and June 30, respectively, and, in default of such payment, the Superintendent, through the corporation counsel, may bring suit to recover the same. Each agent or broker so licensed to procure policies from unauthorized companies shall execute and file with the Department on or before the 10th day of each month an affidavit covering the transactions of the previous calendar month, setting forth (1) the

description and location of the insured property or risk, and the name of the assured; (2) the amount insured in the policy or contract; (3) the gross premiums charged thereon; (4) the name of the company whose policy or contract is issued, and the kind or kinds of business effected; and (5) that said agent or broker after diligent effort was unable to procure the policies or contracts required to protect the property or risk described in the affidavit from companies duly authorized to transact business in the District.

Each agent or broker so licensed to procure policies from unauthorized companies shall keep a separate account of the business transacted thereunder, which shall be open at all times to the inspection of the Superintendent. The license provided for in this section may be revoked or renewal thereof refused for failure to pay the tax or to file the affidavit specified herein, or if the agent or broker procured policies from unauthorized companies without exercising diligent effort to secure the required business in duly authorized companies, or if the agent or broker procured policies from unauthorized companies whose standards of solvency and management do not meet the requirements necessary for the protection of the policyholders.

Sec. 42. License fees: Annual fees to be paid through the Superintendent to the collector of taxes for licenses issued under this act shall be as follows:

(a) For policy-writing agent, or for firms, partnerships, or corporations licensed as such, \$50, without regard to the number of companies represented: *Provided*, That, in the case of firms, partnerships, and corporations, an additional fee of \$5 shall be charged for each person in excess of two who is named in such license as required under section 32 of this act.

(b) For soliciting agent, \$5 for each company represented by such soliciting agent, or for each company represented by any policy-writing agent through which such soliciting agent solicits: *Provided*, That no soliciting agent shall be required to pay for soliciting agents' licenses a sum in excess of \$15 for any one license year.

(c) For salaried company employee authorized to sign policies and to solicit insurance, \$50, without regard to the number of companies represented by such salaried company employee.

(d) For salaried company employee authorized to solicit but not authorized to sign policies, \$5 for each company represented by said employee: *Provided*, That the aggregation of such fees shall not exceed \$15 for any one license year.

(e) For nonresident or resident brokers, \$25, except that the fee shall be \$5 in case the applicant for a resident broker's license is subject also to the fee prescribed under paragraphs (a) or (c) hereof.

(f) For license to procure lines in unauthorized companies, \$15.

(g) Under the license issued to any policy-writing agent or salaried company employee, or in the name of any firm, partnership, or corporation as provided under section 32 of this act, and for which license a fee has been paid in accordance with paragraph (a) or (c) hereof, there may be added names of persons who are employed in or who actively function through the District office of the policy-writing agent, salaried company employee, or firm, partnership, or corporation, and who have company authority to sign but not to solicit policies. For such persons there shall be charged a fee of \$1 per year for each company whose policies such person is authorized to sign.

(h) Broker's licenses may be issued in the names of individuals, firms, partnerships, or corporations. In the case of firms, partnerships, or corporations, the authority to solicit shall extend only to the individuals who are designated in the license and in the application therefor as having authority to solicit, and there shall be charged for each such individual in excess of two an additional fee of \$5.

(i) Licenses to procure lines in unauthorized companies shall be issued in the names of individuals only.

Sec. 43. Testimony; production of books: No person shall be excused from testifying or from producing books, accounts, and papers in any proceeding based upon or growing out of any violation of the provisions of this act, on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to penalty or forfeiture; but no person having so testified shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he may have testified or produced any documentary evidence: *Provided*, That no person so testifying shall be exempted from prosecution or punishment for perjury: *Provided further*, That the immunity hereby conferred shall extend only to a natural person who, in obedience to a subpoena, gives testimony under oath or produces evidence, documentary or otherwise, under oath.

Sec. 44. Penalties not otherwise prescribed: Any person who violates any of the provisions of this act, or fails to comply with any duty imposed upon such person by any of the provisions of this act, for which violation or failure no penalty is elsewhere provided by this act, or by the laws of the District, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined for each offense not exceeding \$1,000 or be imprisoned for not more than 12 months, or both. Prosecutions authorized by this section shall be upon information filed in the police court by the corporation counsel or any of his assistants.

Sec. 45. Any appeal from Superintendent to Commissioners: Any person aggrieved by any action of the Superintendent may, within 20 days after such action was taken, appeal in writing from such action to the Commissioners. The hearings on said appeal may be either orally or in writing at the discretion of the Commissioners, and they shall not be required to take evidence on such appeal.

The decision of the Commissioners on any question of fact on such appeal shall be final and conclusive, except the appeal provided for herein shall not affect the right to proceed under the provisions of section 46.

Sec. 46. Court proceedings: Any person affected by an order, ruling, proceeding, or action of the superintendent, or any person acting in his behalf and at his instance, may contest the validity of the same in any court of competent jurisdiction through any appropriate proceedings. In said proceedings and appeals said Superintendent shall not be taxed with any costs, nor shall he be required to give any supersedeas bond or security for costs or damages on any appeal whatsoever. Said Superintendent shall not be liable to suit or action or for any judgment or decree for any damages, loss, or injury claimed by any person on any appeal taken by said Superintendent in any case, nor shall said Superintendent be required in any case to make any deposit for costs or pay for any service to the clerks of any court or to any marshal of the United States.

Sec. 47. Repeals: All laws or parts of laws, insofar as they relate to business affected hereby, and are in conflict with any of the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 48. Constitutionality: Should any section or provision of this act be held unconstitutional or invalid, the validity of the act as a whole, or of any part thereof, other than the part decided to be unconstitutional or invalid, shall not be affected.

Sec. 49. Effective date of act: Except where otherwise specifically provided herein, this act shall become effective 30 days after approval.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation provides higher standards of solvency, management, and conduct of the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District and extends the scope of the authority of the superintendent of insurance comparable to that he now has under the Life Insurance Act. This legislation would authorize the superintendent of insurance to revoke or suspend the authority to do business of any company which is impaired in capital or surplus, which is insolvent, in such condition that further business would be hazardous to policyholders or creditors, or the public, has refused to pay a valid judgment, has violated the laws of the District or exceeded its charter powers, or similar deficiencies. This legislation is deemed very necessary and has the approval of the Commissioners and the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDER OF DEEDS BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9114) authorizing advancements from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of a recorder of deeds building in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to accept advancements from the District of Columbia from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, created by the National Industrial Recovery Act, and said Administration with the approval of the President is authorized to advance to said Commissioners the sum of \$500,000, or any part thereof, in addition to any sums heretofore advanced to the District of Columbia by said Administration, out of funds authorized by law for said Administration, for the acquisition, purchase, construction, and establishment of a building for the office of the recorder of deeds to be located on premises now known as 515 D Street Northwest, where was formerly the old police court building, as recommended by a committee appointed by the Commissioners under order of January 12, 1940, or upon such other area or areas as shall be approved by said Commissioners and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the making of such advances is hereby included among the purposes for which funds heretofore appropriated or authorized for said Administration, including funds appropriated by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, may be used, in addition to the other purposes specified in the respective acts appropriating or authorizing said funds.

Sec. 2. The sum authorized by section 1 hereof, or any part thereof shall, when advanced, be available to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the acquisition by dedication, purchase, or condemnation of the fee-simple title to land, or rights or easements in land, for the public uses authorized by this act, and for the preparation of plans, designs, estimates, models, and specifications; and for architectural and other necessary professional services required for carrying out the provisions

of this act without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; for the construction of a recorder of deeds building, including materials and labor, heating, lighting, elevators, plumbing, landscaping, and all other appurtenances, and the purchase and installation of machinery, furniture, equipment, apparatus, and any and all other expenditures necessary for or incident to the complete construction and equipment for use of the aforesaid building and plant. All contracts, agreements, and proceedings in court for condemnation or otherwise, pursuant to this act shall be had and made in accordance with existing provisions of law except as otherwise herein provided.

SEC. 3. That the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall be repaid 55 per centum of any moneys advanced under section 1 of this act in annual installments over a period of not to exceed 25 years with interest thereon for the period of amortization: *Provided*, That such sums as may be necessary for the reimbursement herein required of the District of Columbia, and for the payment of interest, shall be included in the annual estimates of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the first reimbursement to be made on June 30, 1944: *Provided further*, That whenever the District of Columbia is under obligation by virtue of the provisions of section 4 of Public Act No. 284, Seventy-first Congress, reimbursement under that act shall not be less than \$300,000 in any one fiscal year.

SEC. 4. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall submit with their annual estimates to the Congress a report of their activities and expenditures under section 1 of this act.

SEC. 5. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are not authorized to borrow any further sum or sums under the provisions of an act of Congress known as Public Law No. 465, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 25, 1934, as amended by Public Law No. 51, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 6, 1935.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is merely to authorize the District Commissioners to secure funds to construct a building for the recorder of deeds here. There is a real need for such a structure, and this measure is merely to call attention to this fact.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the business of the District of Columbia for today.

OUR TROJAN HORSE

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House, every man, woman, and child in this Nation, is alarmed by the terrific spread of this conflagration in Europe. There seems to be no further question that today we are living in a world gone mad. We must face the issue squarely and impassionately. We must keep our heads, stand squarely on both feet.

But, Mr. Speaker, self-preservation is the first law of nature; hence our first duty must be to look out for ourselves, to protect ourselves, to guard ourselves against any possible unnecessary involvement in this catastrophe. If possible, we must keep out of it, so that when it ends America will still remain the beacon light of freedom to the rest of the world. We always have been; let us hope we can always remain so. All our hearts and our sympathies are with those small nations who have felt that iron heel of a ruthless, blood-thirsty invader.

But to me the most alarming thing about the war news from Europe is that in each case the invasion has been made possible mainly because of Trojan horse tactics adopted by the invader. Let us be on our guard against the appearance of a Trojan horse anywhere in this land of ours. Let no "fifth column" gain a foothold in this land. Now, I have no desire to be an alarmist, no desire to be unfair to anyone, but I do feel it is my duty to here and now make public certain information of which I have recently become possessed.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to prove to this House that there is in this land a Trojan horse, a Trojan horse that we have had with us for some time, that I have spoken about previously on this floor. I refer to the Trojan horse in our merchant marine. He is in there, make no mistake about it. One needs to go no further than the indisputable testimony before the Dies committee to learn that he exists. Several weeks ago our very able colleague from Wisconsin

[Mr. KEEFE] very ably pointed to the activities of certain subversive elements operating in the Canal Zone and on our Panama Railroad ships. His accusations to this day have gone unanswered. Oh, I do not care whether you call him a Communist, a Nazi, or a Fascist. He is still an un-American Trojan horse. But the time is here when we must find out how he got into our merchant marine in the first place; how he thrives there now. I want to give this House some thoughts on this matter this afternoon.

May I say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I have the greatest love and admiration for the American seaman. We have ever been dependent upon the seafaring man for our very existence. America would not have been discovered had it not been for those who go down to the sea in ships. Many portions of our country would have been absolutely incapable of development had it not been for our seamen.

For the past 28 years I have been intimately connected with water transportation, for it was back in 1912 that my father helped to develop the self-unloading type of Great Lakes freighter. My father passed on in 1928, but some of these boats still sail the Lakes proudly carrying his name. And I am more than proud to say that the largest boat on fresh water anywhere in the world carries his name. For 18 years I served as an employee of that company, but solely as an employee—never as a stockholder nor in any way a part owner. Today I have no connection whatsoever with that boat line—or any other—excepting by way of sentiment, because I am proud to say that many of the best friends I have in this world follow the water. Many of the men who started back with my father in 1912 are still proudly sailing on those boats. They have never known what it was to have a labor disturbance—they have always made the highest wages ever paid to seamen on any boats anywhere in the world. The employers have constantly striven to give those men the best possible in the way of healthy and safe operating conditions. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel fully justified in arising at this time to come to the defense of those loyal Americans who follow the seas for their livelihood, but who, at this very moment, are being undermined by the Trojan horse of un-Americanism. So with that foreword, let us get down to facts.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all of us should take a pride in the splendid traditions that our distinguished colleague exemplifies, the result of heritages that are his, coming from his father. I feel that we should join in a word of compliment and in saying that he does carry on those traditions and has carried them on during the course of his work here in the House. I believe that he is to be commended for the conscientious way in which he has rendered services so generously here in the House, and for the courage and conviction with which he has approached the problems presented to him. I feel that he exemplifies in every way those splendid traditions of the men of the sea that have helped make America. [Applause.]

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation. May I say that I have a lot of ground to cover here this afternoon in the short time left to me, and I would appreciate it if I am not asked to yield further. I do appreciate the compliments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about 3 weeks after Mr. Harry Hopkins assumed the office of Secretary of Commerce—back in January 23, 1939—a conference was held in his office. At this conference three men were present: Mr. Hopkins himself, Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union of the C. I. O., and still chairman of Mr. John L. Lewis' maritime committee, and the third man was Mr. Ralph Emerson, then legislative representative for the maritime unions within the C. I. O. The better part of that particular afternoon was spent in discussing the future policy to be pursued by the Department of Commerce for maritime labor. It is but natural to assume that those present were especially interested in adopting some policies which might be preferred by Mr. Curran and his C. I. O. group. Mr. Hopkins

listened and finally decided that in view of the many complex problems involved, he would turn the responsibilities of these maritime matters over to one in whom he had implicit confidence.

When Mr. Hopkins had been the boss of the Works Progress Administration, his right-hand man was one David K. Niles, his brother-in-law, who conducted the radical Ford Hall Forum in Boston. So it was but natural that he turn over this complex maritime problem to Mr. Niles. Now he is reputed to be somewhat of a left-wing Progressive and has always been quite popular in the inner New Deal circles. As a matter of fact he should be, for it was he who is reported to have inveigled John L. Lewis into contributing some \$450,000 to the New Deal campaign fund back in 1936, while at the same time he also solicited other large contributions from large employers of labor. So, when it was decided that Mr. Niles was thereafter to become the boss of the maritime industry—particularly the maritime-labor policies—Mr. Hopkins boldly assured the other two conferees—Mr. Curran and Mr. Emerson—that “from now on things would be different,” and they were.

In a remarkably short time Mr. Niles was established in a large suite of offices in the Commerce Building. There were no nameplates on the doors of these offices to signify what titles the occupants bore. In fact it was some months later before Mr. Niles was officially designated as Director of Personnel for the Department of Commerce.

This man Niles was a man of action. He no more than settled himself in his chair than he began to assume a great deal of authority over the entire Department of Commerce. Various bureau chiefs were called in and told that from now on they would get their instructions from his office on certain matters of policy. Some of the assistant secretaries to Mr. Hopkins, who had been key men under the Roper administration were relegated to the background, or, as in the case of Mr. Bell, of the Bureau of Fisheries, found it convenient to resign. Hence it was natural for all those in any minor capacity to realize that they had a new boss from whom to take orders—or else. Legislative bills, referred to the Department for opinion, apparently received their final blessing or condemnation in Mr. Niles' office. It must have been somewhat embarrassing to some of the legal experts of the Department to find themselves writing opinions on legislation which had to conform to Mr. Niles' decision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from reams and reams of testimony before the Dies committee, we have been told that the National Maritime Union of the C. I. O. is controlled by the Communist Party. I am forced to come to that conclusion myself—but in arriving at that conclusion—I want it emphatically understood that I cast no aspersions on the loyalty of by far the larger part of the rank and file of that union. Labor has a right to organize in this country. No man could stand more sincerely on the floor of this House to defend that right, to protect themselves against the abuses of some selfish employers, than myself. But just as emphatically shall I ever insist that each man shall ever be free to join the union of his own free choice—or no union at all. But in the case of the National Maritime Union, the rank and file seem to have no control over their leaders. Members of the rank and file have told me that they know there are Communists in the union, that they know their leaders are controlled by the Communists and that they pray that Congress will come to their aid and help them drive these vultures out of their nests of carrion.

I want to say again that I do not care whether these officials have admitted before the Dies committee, or any other committee, that they are, or have been Communists, or that they approve of the Communists' work, but I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that those birds are un-American, and I charge right now that those men are not working in the interests of labor, they are working for their own selfish means and they would just as soon sell out to either Mussolini or Hitler as to Stalin. And there is the hazard to this country. There is the Trojan horse in our merchant marine. They are the birds that would be the first to

sabotage our merchant marine if we should be unfortunate enough as to be dragged into this European holocaust.

Now, in order to study this whole question let us first take a flying trip to the west coast. Let us see what happened. The dangerous fact that I want to point out to you Members of the House is this: The policies advocated by the leaders of the National Maritime Union and by the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, controlled by Harry Bridges, were immediately put into effect by Niles and are still being carried out. For example the Maritime Commission for some time directly operated a fleet of merchant ships for the United States Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Commission is a part of the United States Government, a part of your Government and mine, a part of a Government that is supposed to be of, by, and for all the people of this Nation. The Maritime Commission very justifiably considered that the employees of those ships were Government employees and, therefore, would not permit the National Labor Relations Board to conduct elections on those ships for the certification of collective-bargaining agencies. I have told you that the Communist Party has control of the National Maritime Union, and, therefore, because most of the crews on those ships were made up almost entirely of C. I. O. seamen, the Communist Party in this country wanted absolute control over those ships. Regardless of the Communist Party angle, we have here this spectacle—to me a disgusting one—of having fellows like Joe Curran, Harry Bridges, and a few more, coming to an agency of the United States Government and telling them bluntly that from now on you and I, the people of the United States, shall be permitted to employ on our own boats only those American citizens, or aliens, who are paying tribute for the privilege of working to a bunch of birds like Bridges and Curran.

The Maritime Commission remained adamant in its position in regard to hiring its own seamen and refused to obtain them from the privately operated hiring halls of the C. I. O. maritime unions, but instead obtained them from the shipping lists kept in the United States Shipping Commissioners' offices set up in the various principal American ports. These shipping commissioners are employees of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation of the Department of Commerce. Therefore, in order to circumvent the Maritime Commission's decision, Curran and his tribe endeavored to have Niles close up the shipping registers so the Maritime Commission would be forced to do business only with the C. I. O. maritime unions.

Now, gentlemen, wherever you see an employment bureau you usually find unemployed men congregated, either inside or out, waiting for a chance to get a job. This is particularly true in the case of the seamen because we are all aware of the fact that the docks, particularly on the seaboard, range over a tremendous amount of water front. In the port of New York alone these docks range over a distance of 200 miles. Therefore, it is natural that the seamen congregate around the employment halls. There is a definite need for them and the Government recognized it and, therefore, set up these Shipping Commissioners' offices.

But now, Mr. Speaker, what do we find? After Curran and his tribe conferred with Niles, there was issued from the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation a memorandum, No. 228, dated May 12, 1939, which I hold here in my hand and from which I quote as follows:

The Shipping Commissioner's office will be open at usual times to seamen who, under the law, have legitimate business with the Shipping Commissioner.

And that includes applying for a job, but now get this—

There shall be no waiting room or assembly hall maintained by the Shipping Commissioner, and seamen will not be permitted to wait in the Shipping Commissioner's office while seeking employment.

Again, on June 21, 1939, there emerged Bureau Memorandum No. 233 containing the same instructions.

These orders were, of course, carried out and naturally a lot of confusion resulted and the seaman, if you please, being denied the privilege of waiting in a government hall owned

by him—by you and me—naturally was forced to go to the National Maritime Union's hiring halls. It is interesting to note right here that Curran and his crowd had no faith that orders from Washington would be carried out, and so they even picketed the shipping commissioner's office at 45 Broadway in New York City to make doubly certain that no free American seamen living under our free flag would be permitted to exercise his rights guaranteed to him by an act of this Congress.

Now there came a time when the Maritime Commission decided to put into operation a trade route from Seattle, Wash., to the Far East. These vessels were to be operated entirely by the Commission until a suitable and proper bid could be obtained from a private operator. When this fiendish alien, Harry Bridges, learned of this plan, he demanded that all seamen to man these Government-owned ships must be obtained from and through the West Coast C. I. O. Maritime Union hiring halls. This bird Bridges is no little puddle duck. He goes after things in a big way, and so he told the Maritime Commission, this Government agency of ours, if you please, that if they did not man these boats according to his instructions he would shut up the entire Pacific coast again and pull another general strike tying up all American shipping on the Pacific coast.

Again, more power to Admiral Land and his Maritime Commission. They told Mr. Bridges to do just exactly what you and I would do—and where he could go—and I do not think it took more than four words to tell him. I leave it to you to guess those words.

But Mr. Bridges, undaunted by a Government order, if you please—and who is that alien to be awed by the United States Government, when he does not even live under its laws, but does not hesitate to demand its protection? What does he do? He threatened to throw a picket line around these ships; as a matter of fact, he did when they arrived at the Pacific ports, keeping those ships—steamship *Coldbrook* and steamship *Satartia*—tied to the dock from June 1 to September of 1939. Meanwhile, he came down to Washington to see his friend Niles. He also conferred with then Attorney General Frank Murphy, hoping to get a ruling from him that would place the operation of all Maritime Commission ships—owned by the Government—publicly owned—on the same basis as those owned by private interest, and, therefore, subject to the Wagner Act. He also had a conference with his friend, Dr. Lewis Bloch, a member of the Maritime Labor Board, whom he had been largely instrumental in putting into office, but the real conference, of course, was with Mr. David K. Niles.

Mr. Speaker, Bridges had an interesting trip; among other things, he appeared before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of this House, which was then holding hearings on H. R. 4051, which was a bill to amend section 301 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. As a matter of fact, he appeared almost exactly a year ago today, May 10, and I have here the record of the hearings before that committee. Some of you Members here may recall there was some question as to whether or not Mr. Bridges should be permitted to testify, in view of the fact that he was not an American citizen. My able colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], whom I succeeded on the Merchant Marine Committee, even called for a vote to decide whether or not Bridges should be permitted to testify. That the committee voted to so permit him was simply because he was presumably the duly selected representative of the West Coast Longshoremen, which he stated had a membership of some 25,000 men, most of whom, as I have said earlier, are red-blooded, loyal American citizens. In the course of his testimony, he stated this:

Our opinions definitely are that the employees concerned (those on the Maritime Commission ships) are not Government employees. It is not our personal opinion, or the opinion of our organization; it is sustained by the best legal talent we have been able to acquire, as well as the legal counsel or opinions from other Government departments, as well as the facts and procedure that we have already experienced over a period of years.

Asked by the chairman what departments he had consulted, Bridges named the counsels and officials of the Treas-

ury Department, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, and the Maritime Labor Board.

Now I am not going to burden this House by reading more out of this document, because it is all available to you, but I do want to point out this: That our able colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] endeavored to learn by repeated questioning from Mr. Bridges the names of the Government officials with whom he had consulted—the men he said had given him this opinion—and the only names that Mr. Bridges mentioned were David K. Niles and Mr. Steve Gibbons, then assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury. Incidentally, it is quite interesting to note that Mr. Bridges pointed out that their seamen and theirs alone—those who were paying tribute to him—were the only ones who might be employed or permitted to work on other Government craft operated on the Pacific, and he mentioned, specifically, light-house tenders of the Treasury Department, also Coast and Geodetic Survey ships operated by the Department of Commerce, and stated further:

The Department of the Interior operates vessels under a direct written agreement with us, with men of our organization.

So, we see Honest Harold, too, enters the picture. I understand his name has recently been changed to Donald Duck because he quacks and quacks and quacks, and does not lay any eggs.

Again we have the disgusting spectacle of a department of this Government, of, by, and for all the people, entering into a contract with a bird like Bridges saying that only free American citizens who pay tribute to Bridges shall be permitted to work on craft which they, themselves, own.

Now reading further in the hearings, gentlemen, we find Bridges testifying that he is not a Communist. For, under direct questioning by our very able colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], he denied that he was or ever had been a Communist, but he did state:

It seems to me, in my experience, that Communists are active everywhere. It is a question of what their activities are concerned with that generally causes trouble.

I agree with him—and then again on a direct question from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], "Have you ever counseled with them or cooperated with them?" Mr. Bridges replied, "I have."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us leave the Pacific coast for a while, and come back inland to the Inland Waterways Corporation, another Government owned and operated shipping industry. The Inland Waterways Corporation operates the well-known Federal Barge Line on the Mississippi River, and its various tributaries. This is one of the few Government enterprises that I know of that actually has shown a profit, although the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] may charge that it is merely a paper profit. However he may feel about it, their annual report for 1938, copy of which you all received, shows that in that year they had a net income from the operation of the Federal Barge Line, the Warrior River Terminal Co., and several smaller subsidiaries of \$1,105,449.71 as compared to \$253,935.49 in 1937. The Inland Waterways Corporation was then being operated under the War Department, and the chairman of the board and president was Maj. Gen. T. Q. Ashburn.

Now, let us turn to page 12 of this 1938 report under the heading "Labor Conditions." We find that General Ashburn reports as follows:

The most important event in the terminal department during the year 1938 was the complete unionization of the terminal laborers on the lower Mississippi from New Orleans to St. Louis. This reached a climax in April when it was necessary to stop operations for 12 days, until we came to an agreement with the Congress of Industrial Organization and the American Federation of Labor Unions.

Being unable to get together on wages, we, however, reached a decision to submit the wage rates to an arbitration board appointed by the Department of Labor, and to abide by its decision. This Board carried on an investigation and established the rates at the various terminals, which we are now paying. In the signing of our contracts with the unions, we have had all the trouble that goes with new unions. Although in all of our contracts we called for arbitration of all disputes and no cessation of work for any cause whatever, our men have repeatedly failed to carry out

their part of the contract with us, and we have experienced strikes at Cairo, Memphis, Helena, Baton Rouge, St. Louis, and Peoria. Most of the strikes were over matters of a minor nature which could have been easily settled by arbitration. We have spent the greater part of the year trying to make the men realize what a contract meant, and they were supposed to live up to their agreement.

So, it would appear that General Ashburn was having his trouble, and now let us see if we can dig into the bottom of that mess.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I regret that I have not the time to yield, but I thank the gentleman for his interest.

Now enters the picture one Felix Siren; he is one of Joe Curran's chief lieutenants and a well-known Communist in maritime-labor circles. He was actively engaged in attempting to organize the inland boatmen working on harbor craft around the port of New York and trying to bring them under the control of the National Maritime Union. His direct superiors were the Communist Party leaders in New York, Tommy Ray and Al Lannon—alias Al Vittiri—both of whom were referred to by our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and are exposed in the book "We Accuse." But in the port of New York the American Federation of Labor's longshoremen's union, known as the International Longshoremen's Association, had too strong a hold on the harbor through their affiliates among the harbor boatmen, and so the Communist Party program to control New York Harbor fell rather flat, with a thud.

Now this bird, Felix Siren, is apparently quite a tough guy. He gets real tough. He carries a gun.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the official court records of the case of the people of the State of New York, ex rel. Frank Harris, against the Warden, dated December 23, 1937. I will not take the time of this House to read through all of this testimony; and, incidentally, I will not particularly compliment the official stenographer that took down this testimony. The gist of the case, however, is this: It appears that there was one Frank Harris. He was an organizer under the direction of Felix Siren. While Siren was head of the organizing committee for the boatmen in New York Harbor, he attempted at all times to have Communist Party members appointed as his assistants. However, occasionally some militant trade-unionist who was not a Communist Party member would get on his staff, and Siren would take on these fellows in the hopes of converting them over to the Communist Party. Frank Harris was one of these men, and through him and through this particular case of which I have the record here it was divulged to the public that every organizer on Siren's committee was forced to kick-back a part of his weekly pay earnings to the Communist Party. After he had first refused to kick-back any of his wages to Siren and was threatened with dismissal, and needing a job, Harris finally agreed to kick-back \$5 a week, and in return he received a regular receipt from the Communist Party. After several pay periods had gone by, Siren decided that Harris was then ripe to join the Communist Party and demanded that he join or get out. Harris begged off, stating he knew nothing of politics and preferred to keep out of the party. However, Siren became suspicious and discharged him, and it was when Harris came back to him to get the balance of the money due him for his wages that Siren demanded that he return to him the receipts which he had received from the Communist Party kick-backs. When Harris told him that he did not have these receipts, Siren refused to give him the money. The money was there, however, and Harris grabbed it, and it was then that Siren pulled a gun on him and threatened to shoot him if he did not immediately turn over those receipts. Harris grappled with him, and the gun went off in the air, and then the police entered in, and the court case is the result.

So this is the fellow Siren who was sent to the Gulf by the Communist Party to try and help organize the various maritime groups around New Orleans and almost immediately got in trouble with the police down there during the teamsters' strike and was escorted to the city limits by the New Orleans

police and told to get out and stay out. So he then went up along the Mississippi River, acting through the front men of the Communist Party within the National Maritime Union. Here he was told to go ahead and organize all of the employees of the Federal Barge Line. Evidently an understanding had been reached in Washington between certain New Deal officials and their contacts in the War Department whereby the C. I. O. would be permitted to carry on an organizational campaign among the workers on these barges.

No protest was made by the War Department as to their employees on the Federal Barge Line being classified as Federal Government workers, but everyone concerned was given to understand that these employees would be regarded as having the same status as employees for a private corporation. It is interesting to note, however, that no attempt was made to have the N. L. R. B. intervene in this situation to determine the proper collective-bargaining agency because it was felt that any intervention by the Labor Relations Board might result in too much publicity and cause some question to arise as to whether or not the employees of a Government owned and operated corporation would become subject to the Wagner Act. Siren continued his organization work very quietly. In that work he imported several Communist Party lieutenants to help him carry on and to establish on the river a nucleus for the Communist Party. And just as soon as the Communist Party felt that it was strong enough they suddenly presented to the Federal Barge Line a set of demands, which included the closed shop for the C. I. O.

General Ashburn agreed to enter into negotiations with Siren, after realizing that there could be no expectations of assistance from the New Deal in resisting the inroads of the Communist Party upon his domain. In fact, pressure was also put upon him by the Department of Labor, which assigned a conciliator, one Major Estes, to bring the two parties to an agreement if possible.

A conference was held in Washington, at which time there were present General Ashburn and his ranking assistants from the Federal Barge Line, Felix Siren for the employees—and also for the Communist Party—Major Estes from the Department of Labor, and Ralph Emerson for the maritime unions of the C. I. O. All points that were in dispute were settled at this conference, and it was agreed that Ashburn should meet with Siren in St. Louis within a few days to consummate the agreement. This was done, and the C. I. O. was practically given a closed shop on a silver platter.

However, Siren and his greedy advisers were not content to let well enough alone, and so the old Trojan horse went to work to get rid of Ashburn because they felt that he was wise to their game and they feared some time in the future he might possibly buck their machine. Therefore, it was with great rejoicing that the President's reorganization plan was announced, and it was found that the Inland Waterways Corporation was to be transferred to the Department of Commerce. Siren immediately contacted Emerson and arranged for a conference with David Niles to discuss the policy of the Federal Barge Line. A lengthy conference was held in Niles' office, at which both Siren and Emerson were present. That conference can be summarized briefly by stating Niles' parting words, "Ashburn would be taken care of in the near future"—and he was. General Ashburn is now in private life and has been since November 15, 1939. Thus we see that once more through the well-known tactics of the Trojan horse we have a blitzkrieg put on a trusted Federal official, Maj. Gen. T. Q. Ashburn, who had successfully operated the Federal Barge Line for 15 years, having been appointed to his post by President Calvin Coolidge, and having survived the New Deal for almost 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, to me there is one interesting aftermath to the preceding discussion. Yesterday it was my privilege to read this speech to General Ashburn personally, because I wanted to be certain that my statements were in accord with the facts. The general told me that while the Inland Waterways was under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, he many times received word that Mr. Niles insisted upon this or that procedure, but to this day General Ashburn has never met Mr. Niles or had the privilege of even talking

to him. Mr. Niles never once gave him an order direct, nor did he ever show him the courtesy of a visit, yet relayed his orders through others. General Ashburn found that those orders had to be carried out. Shortly before his dismissal the general received a letter of warm personal commendation from the President of the United States, and yet when it was announced that he was to be dismissed, despite all of the personal pressure and political pressure he could bring to bear, General Ashburn was denied even the privilege of presenting his side of the controversy to the President of the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us continue our transcontinental journey eastward until we come to the Great Lakes, on which I live and with the welfare of whose seamen I am so much concerned. How is my friend, the Trojan horse, proceeding to operate on the Great Lakes to undermine those seamen of whom I am so proud and with whom I was so long associated?

To understand the past history of the Trojan horse on the Great Lakes we must fly east to New York. There we find one Mervyn Rathborne, now president of the American Communications Association, and, incidentally, who was the same man appointed by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt to the National Advisory Council of the National Youth Administration. How did this come about? Simply because Aubrey Williams took Rathborne up to Hyde Park to have lunch with the First Lady and she recommended his appointment on the grounds that he was an able and aggressive labor leader. Now, this chap Rathborne turns up to be a rather well-known member of the Communist Party and had been put in charge of all of the organizing for the maritime industry for the C. I. O., and it was through John Brophy, then secretary of the C. I. O., that the money passed to the maritime industry through the medium of Rathborne. Then Rathborne, having the funds, would dish out the jobs as head of organizing groups, and these jobs always went to good Communist Party members. It was in this manner that our friend Siren was put in charge of organizing the New York Harbor, and in the same manner the Trojan horse of the Great Lakes, one M. Hedley Stone, whose real name was Murray Stein, was put in charge of organizing the Great Lakes seamen. Now, this fellow Stone is no dumbbell. He was smart enough to select other well-known Communist Party members as his assistants and, with one exception, had a complete Communist Party nucleus with him when he started organizing the Great Lakes. The lone exception was one James Mullen, who had been the legislative assistant to Ralph Emerson for the National Maritime Union in Washington. Emerson, sensing the fact that the Communist Party was attempting to completely control the organization on the Great Lakes, put up a fight at Washington at the C. I. O. headquarters, and to keep him quiet Mullen was put on the Great Lakes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they did a pretty good job; they sent Mullen just about as far away as they could on the Great Lakes, clear up to the head of the Lakes—Duluth, Minn. Mullen had hardly settled in his office before he was visited by the organizer for the Communist Party for that particular district and informed that when he signed the seamen up in the union he was at the same time to sign them up in the Communist Party. Mullen, being as Irish-American as his name sounds, promptly threw that bird out of the office on the seat of his pants. And so we find that Mullen, quite naturally, did not get along so good after that with Murray Stein or M. Hedley Stone, whichever name appeals to you, and while he stuck around for a while, nevertheless, eventually he gave up his National Maritime Union activities, and we now find him as a field representative for the United States Maritime Commission in the port of New York.

Finally, it appears that our friend Stone becomes a bit more brazen and seamen who call for him in his N. M. U. office in Cleveland quite frequently have to find him in the Communist Party headquarters. And now we find that he has installed one Hays-Jones as his assistant in the Cleveland headquarters.

Now, this cuckoo Hays-Jones is an interesting chap. We find that he is an old-time Communist member who had gone to Russia as a workers' delegate way back in 1934 and was the author of the pamphlet *In a Soviet America—Seamen and Longshoremen Under the Red Flag*. That must have been a beautiful work because it sold for 5 cents, and I call your attention to the replica of the cover of that pamphlet on page 179 of the book *We Accuse*. (Since I delivered this speech on the floor, I have learned through a published interview, which Hays-Jones gave the Cleveland Press, that I am in error; that he made his first trip to Russia in 1933 as a "representative of the seamen on the New York water front," and further that he had subsequently made other trips to Russia as a working seaman.) This Hays-Jones is also now the corresponding editor on the Great Lakes for the National Maritime Union Pilot and on their pay roll as such. However, he is not such a good editor as he might be.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a part of the April 19 issue of the National Maritime Union paper *The Pilot*. On page 9 thereof is a very illuminating report "L. C. A. (meaning the Lake Carriers Association, made up of the vessel owners on the Great Lakes)—L. C. A. Shipowners Entertain Government Officials Who Handle Marine Affairs," and it lists all those down here in Washington, either Government employees or officials, and even Members of Congress, who dared to accept an invitation to go to dinner with some men who should be outcasts from society because they dared to own and operate a vessel on the Great Lakes. I'm proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was in attendance at that meeting, but I'm a little bit ashamed to find out that Mr. Hays-Jones didn't include me on the list of those who attended. But I do want to call your attention to one particular item in the account which says "Newspaper reports did not record whether the Government officials had their fare paid by the Lake Carriers, whether they paid their own, or whether they rode on Government vouchers." Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to report that whenever I travel around this country, I am more than glad to pay my own expenses, as I did on that occasion, and I believe that all the other Members of Congress, and the rest of those there, paid their own expenses. I hope that you will convey that information to Mr. Jones so that he may be able to report more correctly in the future.

Now, further reading on this page, Mr. Speaker, we find that the Trojan horse is really going to work on the Great Lakes and we find that Mr. M. Hedley Stone and his buddy, Hays-Jones, have increased their organizing group to a total of 12 men. And, I learn "All necessary gear to line up the crews has been distributed to the organizers, and they will pass it on to ship's delegates as fast as they can establish a delegate on a ship. Of course, they'll do plenty themselves; this is no '8-hour-day' job for the organizers."

Apparently the organizers themselves, even as you and I, my colleagues, don't come under the Wagner Act or even the Wage and Hour Act, limiting them to 40 hours per week, although both of us get more than 30 cents an hour.

You ask me, Is this simply a drive to obtain members for a union or is the Trojan horse operating for another purpose? Think quietly for a moment what would happen if this Nation got into war, and by the simple process of either sabotaging ships or calling a general strike in Great Lakes shipping, what would happen to the great steel centers on the Great Lakes and Pittsburgh? Where would our Army and our Navy get the steel needed for munitions of war? As a matter of fact, it has been reliably reported to me from a number of different sources that it is planned to call a general strike in the ore boats sailing the Great Lakes, due to the fact that the Communist Party has learned that the stockpiles of ore now on the docks at the great steel centers are very low and a prosperous shipping season is looked forward to. These Great Lakes freighters have just recently started in operation for the year, and you may look for a strike call almost any time from now on.

Now we come to another interesting possibility on the Great Lakes as well as elsewhere. On April 27 last I received, as I presume every other Member did, an interesting little

pamphlet entitled "Who's Guilty?" It is 47 pages long and on the last page we find a very illuminating recommendation to the Congress of the United States from which I read as follows:

1. That an immediate investigation be instituted into the personnel, make-up, and activities of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation;
2. That immediate and sympathetic consideration be given by the proper committees to recent proposals of the Maritime Labor Board with regard to bringing the navigation laws up to date;
3. That the Secretary of Commerce be urged immediately to halt intervention in labor disputes by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and to halt the practice of suspending and revoking seamen's certificates for participation in legitimate trade-union activities;
4. That the laws authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to appoint inspectors be amended to provide that inspectors be appointed or selected in accordance with civil-service laws and regulations; and
5. That Commander R. S. Field, Director of the Bureau be immediately removed from office for his betrayal of the trust placed in him by representatives of the American people.

Thus, my colleagues, does the C. I. O. Maritime Committee and the National Maritime Union of America recommend to the Congress. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we find this booklet warmly applauded and most highly approved of in an interesting article which appeared in the famous Communist Party publication *The Daily Worker* under date of April 29. Thus do we learn that the Communist Party wholeheartedly joins in these recommendations to you, my colleagues of the House and Senate.

Now, Commander R. S. Field, United States Navy, retired, was appointed in September 1937 to succeed Mr. Joseph Weaver as Director of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. Personally, I had always thought that he had done a very commendable job. In his first annual report to the C. I. O. maritime unions on legislation, Ralph Emerson, then the C. I. O.'s legislative representative for the maritime industry, reported that better relations had been established for the seamen with the Bureau since Field took office and explained why. However, the Communist Party leaders in control of the maritime union were not satisfied that an impartial director was in actual charge of the Bureau and decided that when the proper time came they would get rid of Field and supplant him with someone who would see things from the Communist viewpoint completely. Commander Field was appointed while Daniel C. Roper was Secretary of Commerce. However, as soon as Mr. Hopkins succeeded Roper, Niles was brought into the picture and the leaders of the N. M. U. then proceeded to lay plans to get Field. Having absolutely no charges they could make against him under any pretext, they laid the basis for a campaign which would enable them to build up a case against him. They connived with Niles to first relegate Field to the background during the tankers' strike in the spring of 1939. Mr. Niles picked on one Allan Jones, counsel for the Bureau, as the most likely man to deal with in the campaign to discredit Field. Thereupon during the entire tankers' strike, complaints and recommendations of a policy from the N. M. U. were handled through Jones and Niles, and Field was left pretty much out of the picture. In fact, no one would have known that Field was in office as Director insofar as his being considered was concerned.

Now, I do not say that many of the seamen's complaints against the tanker companies might not have been justified, particularly with regard to the treatment of the seamen employees, but it is a well-known fact that compared with other seagoing personnel on other types of vessels, the tankermen were better off. In fact, the only excuse that the N. M. U. could find for starting this strike was the fact that some of the oil companies would not hire from the rotary system in force in the National Maritime Union hiring halls. In fact, the companies were even willing to let the National Maritime Union have a delegate supervise the hiring from the companies' hiring office. For this desk space was furnished to the union delegate so that he could be assured that only union men were being put on the tankers. But, even this did not satisfy the Communist Party which controlled the N. M. U. as then they would be forced to operate the rotary

system fairly and not be able to send their specially hand-picked Communist Party members to form units for the Communist Party on all of the American tankers. Another reason for the strike was their desire to use it as a means for getting complete control of the National Maritime Union and ousting the remaining few N. M. U. officials who were not actually Communists. So we see that with Niles actually running the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation through Allan Jones, everything was set for Curran and his hand-picked crew and the history of the tankers' strike will show that every excuse was used by the Bureau to help the N. M. U. fight the tanker concerns. The fines levied on the tanker companies for alleged violations of the law during this period is proof of this. This strike was run 100 percent by the Communists and Niles apparently lent himself to the plot willingly. It is almost inconceivable that Niles was not aware of the identity of the real leaders behind this strike because it was during the latter part of this strike that Emerson exposed the Communist Party control of the National Maritime Union by his open letter which was published in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of June 20, 1939, in a speech made by the gentleman from New York, Congressman JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN. Emerson also sent a copy of that same letter to Niles and Jones—which both disregarded.

Now, having tried to take all the power of the Bureau out of the hands of the director, the plotters now conspired as to how they could best put him out of office. It was some months before another incident presented itself that they could use. This was the famous *City of Flint* case. Here enters one William Standard, the Communist Party lawyer for the National Maritime Union. Standard was able to induce only two members out of the entire ship's crew to enter into the conspiracy against the Director of the Bureau. Standard charged that the captain of the *City of Flint* had not used his best judgment in the protection of the American crew while the ship was in Murmansk, Russia, and in Tromsø, Norway.

However, this case fell flat owing to the fact that Captain Gainard was received by the American public as a hero for his remarkable feat of having brought his vessel and the entire crew safely back to the United States. Commander Field, who had refused to act on Standard's recommendation to revoke Gainard's license, became more popular than ever and thus the plotters themselves were put on the spot.

Hence the reason for this remarkable little booklet, *Who's Guilty?* It contains a complete history of the Bureau's activities and they use this against Field, taking the position that in the final analysis all responsibility for the Bureau's action must be laid at Commander Field's door even though, insofar as they were concerned, he might be considered only a rubber stamp insofar as the policies of the Bureau itself were concerned.

Now this book is full of a number of various cases in which they claim that Commander Field did not act properly and "betrayed the trust placed in him by representatives of the American people." But we find that it is quite peculiar in that the cases listed in the booklet alleging to show where fines were mitigated by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation in favor of the shipowners were not once taken into courts on appeal by the legal lights of the National Maritime Union, and this is specifically provided for in the law. The law permits this procedure if the union is not satisfied with the final ruling of the Bureau and the Secretary of Commerce, and it would be the natural procedure, if the union thought for one moment that it was in the right, to appeal such cases to our courts.

Therefore, it seems to me that this booklet could not serve any genuine purpose by being published at this time as all available channels had not been used by the union to obtain satisfaction.

This brings us up to the present situation where I hear that relations are somewhat strained in the Bureau between the Director and the office of the Secretary of Commerce. In fact in the Communist Party maritime circles they are circulating reports among themselves that Commander Field will not be the Director after June 1. Two candidates are

being mentioned as his possible successor. One is Allan Jones, whom I have previously mentioned at length. The other is one Mr. Hoyt Haddock. Haddock was formerly the president of the American Radio Telegraphers' Association which is now known as the American Communications Association, headed by Mervyn Rathborne. Haddock resigned from his radio position when the Communists found that they could get him a job as personnel director of the Standard Oil Tanker fleet, using the usual Trojan-horse policy. As soon as Standard Oil found out his true colors, they ousted him. Now we find him bobbing up as a candidate for Commander Field's job.

Thus we learn, Mr. Speaker, that Harry Hopkins' right bower—David K. Niles—together with his choice associates in the National Maritime Union—and the Communist Party—today rule the waves on which our merchant marine sails. I wonder whether David Niles, hopes likewise to rule the air lanes of this Nation by pulling the strings behind the scenes because this same David Niles was unusually active in these very corridors on Tuesday last, when we were about to vote on Reorganization Plan IV—primarily designed to return aviation to the chaotic control of the Department of Commerce—for some fantastic reason—as yet not fully explained to the satisfaction of any thinking person. Maybe this is spinach, maybe it is not, but at least it is worth while looking into.

Now, my colleagues of the House, again I say, in conclusion, we are today living in a world gone mad. Let us help to protect the American seamen and the American Merchant Marine, it is our own funeral if we do not. If I have this afternoon succeeded in driving this Trojan horse out into the open, so that you may all see him, I feel that I have done a sincere duty to my country. The American seamen need a free America and a free America needs the free American seamen. [Applause.]

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman mention the name of David Niles.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. He happens to come from my State.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I understand that he is a very fine man.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I know nothing about him except from personal connection, and I would like to know whether the gentleman has any information which would associate him with the Communist Party.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I have none whatsoever, excepting insofar as he is associated with Mr. Curran and others.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I know nothing about it, but would like to know whether the gentleman has any information that would associate him with the Communist Party.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I know nothing about his background in that particular.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Saturday Evening Post in relation to the war in Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. DAVID K. NILES, MR. STEVE GIBBONS, AND GENERAL ASHBURN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in listening to the remarks of our distinguished friend

and colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. My purpose in rising is to in noway discuss any of the statements he made, except to make some brief reference to Mr. Niles and to Mr. Gibbons and also to General Ashburn. I have known Mr. Niles for a great many years. Mr. Niles is a fine gentleman, a very fine American, and equally a very fine public official. I know nothing about any of these conferences referred to. We all have conferences with people that we do not like. I know many people come to see me that I do not like. People come to see me with whom I have nothing in common, but in the performance of my official duties, as a matter of courtesy and decency, I must see them, and I do see them no matter what my personal feelings might be. I assume that officials of any administration have had conferences with representatives of maritime or other unions, if they had occasion to see them in connection with any matters that were in controversy, or that they wanted to discuss with them. I do know, however, that Mr. Niles is a man in whom I have complete confidence.

I think the Members who have been here for some years will remember that 4 or 5 or 6 years ago I was one of the few Members who called attention to the dangers of the subversive forces in this country. I was chairman of the special committee that preceded the Dies committee in the investigation of the subversive forces of this Nation. I have constantly condemned and combated them, and I will as long as I live, no matter who they are or where they are at present, or in the future. As a matter of fact I am the author of a bill which compels propagandists of foreign interests to register with the Secretary of State, an effective piece of legislation to combat the subversive forces of our country. That bill grew out of the evidence that we uncovered in connection with our investigation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman agrees with me that those men, whether they are Communists, Nazis, or Fascists, would just as soon sell out to anybody? They are looking out for themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are all bad—Nazis and Fascists are as bad as Communists. As a matter of fact, they are the unnatural offsprings of communism.

Now, in connection with the dismissal of General Ashburn; there may be reasons that existed outside of the limited reference made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. I know nothing about it, except this: If there is any significance to be attached between Mr. Curran and these others and Dave Niles and any communistic influence, it is natural to assume that the man who would be appointed to succeed the General would be one along such lines; yet, the one who was appointed was, until recently, a very distinguished Member of this House, a very able member of the Committee on Ways and Means, "Chet" Thompson of Illinois. He was appointed in his place. If ever there is a sound American, one in whom we would all have confidence, it is "Chet" Thompson. I know nothing about the circumstances surrounding the resignation of General Ashburn, but I do know that the one who succeeded the General is certainly one outstanding American that each and every one of us who know him have complete confidence in.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I did not hear that part of the gentleman's remarks in which he referred to General Ashburn. I presume he must have referred to the Inland Waterways Corporation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course, anybody who served in this House with Chester Thompson knows the caliber of the man. Anybody who knows Dave Niles likewise knows the caliber of the man, as I know him and as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows him; but I can state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I know something about the separation of General Ashburn. I will say to him that while I did not hear what the gentleman from Michigan said with reference

to General Ashburn or any charges he may have made, I feel the administration was justified in making a change.

That there was no politics in the change is evidence because General Ashburn, appointed by President Coolidge, held the office for 6 years during the Roosevelt administration. General Ashburn reached the retirement age; but there were other reasons for the change.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply wanted to address myself to the limited reference made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] that there must be some more evidence besides the fact that Dave Niles at some time had a conference with somebody that the gentleman from Michigan does not like, and the fact that anyone was separated from service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POAGE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask for 3 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. About the best evidence that there cannot be any of the left-wing influence is the fact that "Chet" Thompson was appointed to succeed the General. "Chet" Thompson is just as far removed from any such influence as any real American can be.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The fact that a man might be of good character does not necessarily mean that all activities were proper? I suppose the gentleman can remember back in his boyhood days when some minister in the neighborhood ran away with the soprano in the choir? [Laughter.]

Mr. McCORMACK. That is rather the exception, however.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know it is exceptional, but it does happen.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, everything happens in life. There is practically nothing that cannot happen in life.

Now, with reference to the *City of Flint* incident, I do know that Dave Niles absolutely supported Captain Gainard. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] talked about Captain Fields. I am a great admirer of Captain Fields, and I join with him in the hope that Captain Fields will be continued in service, but I do know that Dave Niles also supported Captain Gainard because I personally was interested in that. Captain Gainard and his family come from Boston, and, as a matter of fact, while he does not live in my district now, his folks do live in my district. So I was particularly interested in Captain Gainard, not only because of my admiration for him, but because of the fact that his family are residents of my district and he and his wife are residents of the district represented by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They live in my district.

Mr. McCORMACK. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Both he and his wife are tremendously interested in young boys, to give them a lift-up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I stand corrected by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] as to the present residence of Captain Gainard.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts fully appreciates the fact that the gentleman from Michigan was not attacking Mr. Niles personally, but was trying to emphasize the point that because he came into such intimate association with individuals who were avowed Communists and seems to be influenced by them to such an extent that it makes it very obvious that possibly he is more or less inclined one way or the other insofar as that work is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think that the gentleman from Michigan went even that far. I think the gentleman from New York undertakes to place an interpretation upon his statement that the gentleman himself did not make in his presentation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. It is a fact—and I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree with me—that what he is doing at the present time is simply lending his approval to the philosophy expounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] in a speech that he made this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely; but also contributing my knowledge of Mr. Niles.

Mr. DITTER. Contributing such additional information that the gentleman from Massachusetts has.

Mr. McCORMACK. Again, I say that I did not understand the gentleman from Michigan to make any charges at all.

Mr. DITTER. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. And one of the reasons I take the floor this afternoon is to join with him in his condemnation of subversive elements in this country and to expose them just as much as possible. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Just to keep the RECORD straight. As I said a moment ago, I did not hear what the gentleman from Michigan had to say with reference to General Ashburn, of the Inland Waterways Corporation; but since the transfer to the Department of Commerce from the War Department it has not been under Mr. Niles; it has been under the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I want to tell the gentleman from Massachusetts that I did not accuse Mr. Niles of anything. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts misunderstood my statement. What I said was that possibly the gentleman's associations permitted some suspicion to be directed toward him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the gentleman perfectly.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I want to inquire as to what position Niles held. The last I knew of Niles he was running the W. P. A. up in Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows Dave Niles.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know him very well. I just met him on the train several times.

Mr. McCORMACK. He was associated with Mr. Hopkins in the works program and went with Mr. Hopkins to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But what is he doing here?

Mr. McCORMACK. He is Director of Personnel in the Commerce Department. Naturally, when Mr. Hopkins was appointed Secretary of Commerce he wanted associates in whom he had confidence, the same as anyone of us would want if we were placed in a position of such responsibility. We would want around us people in whom we had confidence.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman will find that I said that Mr. Hopkins turned it over to a man in whom he had confidence.

Mr. McCORMACK. My main purpose in rising was to show that the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan were not intended as an attack upon Mr. Niles but to put in the RECORD a situation which he felt he should comment on.

So far as Mr. Niles is concerned, as I have already said, he is a fine gentleman, a very fine American, and equally a very fine public official. If he was asked, he could and would satisfactorily answer any inquiries made of him in connection with the matters discussed by the gentleman from Michigan. I am glad that I was on the floor at the time of the gentleman's remarks so that I could convey to the gentleman and

my colleagues the fine type of a man, citizen, and public official that Dave Niles is.

Reference has also been made to "Steve" Gibbons—Stephen B. Gibbons, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. It is needless for me to make extended references to him, as he is well known by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Certainly no one could even remotely accuse him of any thoughts other than strictly consistent with American thought. Like Dave Niles, "Steve" Gibbons, as his numerous friends call him, is a gentleman and a great American. His service as a public official was outstanding. I keenly regretted his voluntary resignation, and I hope that his conditions will permit an early return to public life. We need more of his type and of the type of Dave Niles in the service of the public.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER, for 4 days, on account of illness in family.
To Mr. RISK, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6965. An act for the relief of Stina Anderson.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6264. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6965. An act for the relief of Stina Anderson;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the establishment of Greenwich, Conn., as a town;

H. R. 8319. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and for the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 519. Joint resolution to suspend section 510 (g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, during the present European war, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 14, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Tuesday, May 14, 1940, at 10 a. m.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on S. 280 and H. R. 145—motion pictures. All statements favoring the bill will be heard first. All statements opposing the bill will follow.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Thursday, May 16, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 9384, H. R. 9386, and H. R. 9388, all of which relate to amendments to the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold the following hearings at 10 a. m. on the dates specified:
Tuesday, May 14, 1940:

H. R. 9553, to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

LXXXVI—379

Thursday, May 16, 1940:

H. R. 9477, to apply laws covering steam vessels to certain passenger-carrying vessels.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining that was appointed to consider S. 2420 will hold hearings beginning Thursday, May 16, 1940, at 10 a. m., in the committee rooms in the New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on Tuesday, May 21, 1940, at 10 a. m., at which time the committee will consider the subject of maritime unemployment insurance.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Tuesday, May 14, and Wednesday, May 15, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of the following:

Tuesday, May 14: H. R. 8310, to deport Communists.

Wednesday, May 15: Unfinished business and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be held before subcommittee No. IV of the Committee on the Judiciary a hearing on H. R. 8963, to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act (to include chiropractic practitioners). The hearing will be held at 10 a. m. May 22, 1940, in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1606. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce amounting to \$250 for the fiscal year 1896, \$37,000 for the fiscal year 1940, and \$39,360 for the fiscal year 1941, in all, \$76,610 (H. Doc. No. 725); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1607. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for administrative expenses, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to \$1,700,000 (H. Doc. No. 726); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1608. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Gen. Anthony Wayne Memorial Commission, which provision would continue available the unobligated balance of that appropriation during the fiscal year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 727); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1609. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to \$142,000 (H. Doc. No. 728); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1610. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the Veterans' Administration and the National Archives for the fiscal year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 729); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1611. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department, for the fiscal year 1940, amounting to \$15,000 (H. Doc. No. 730); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1612. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of State, for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941, amounting to \$28,500, and five drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for

that Department (H. Doc. No. 731); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1613. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941 amounting to \$163,780, and two drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 732); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1614. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1940 (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1615. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1937 in the sum of \$124.23 and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1940 aggregating \$543,500, together with a draft of proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 734); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1616. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriation for the legislative establishment, United States House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1940, aggregating \$115,000 (H. Doc. No. 735); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1617. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting six supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941 for the Department of Agriculture, totaling \$21,180,000, and a proposed provision affecting an existing appropriation for that Department for the fiscal year 1940 (H. Doc. No. 736); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1618. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to \$12,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 737); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1619. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 738); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1620. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1940 in the amount of \$820,000 (H. Doc. No. 739); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1621. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the Federal Housing Administration, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the United States Housing Authority for the fiscal year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 740); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1622. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1941, and prior fiscal years (H. Doc. No. 741); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1623. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1940, and prior fiscal years amounting to \$239,965.01, together with a proposed authorization for the expenditure of \$25,000 from Indian tribal funds (H. Doc. No. 742); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1624. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, amounting to \$2,900,000, of which \$1,354,750 is to remain available until expended, for seacoast defenses, Insular Departments, together with a proposed provision affecting the appropriation for acquisition of land for radio beacons, Army, contained in the Military Appropriation Act,

1939 (H. Doc. No. 743); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1625. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the Department of State, Rio Grande canalization, fiscal year 1941, amounting to \$310,000, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 744); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1626. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriations contingent expenses, Foreign Service, Department of State, for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941 (H. Doc. No. 745); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1627. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1934 and 1936 amounting to \$530.11 and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941, amounting to \$2,084,374.49, in all \$2,084,904.60, together with a draft of proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 746); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1628. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for renovation and modernization loans and insurance, Federal Housing Administration (allocation from Reconstruction Finance Corporation) for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to \$2,000,000 of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (H. Doc. No. 748); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1629. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a proposed bill to extend section 52 of the Criminal Code to offenses on Indian lands and reservations or in national parks or forests and to increase from 2 years to 5 years the maximum term of imprisonment that may be imposed for such a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1630. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 30, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pawtuxet River, R. I., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 747); to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1631. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a view of opposition to H. R. 9525, and other bills, relating to the reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia, which contain provisions that would remove the District government from the jurisdiction of the Budget and Accounting Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 8582. A bill to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers; with amendment (Rept. No. 2145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2999. An act to legalize a bridge across Bayou Lafourche at Galiano, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2152). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3183. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near La Crosse, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2153). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3254. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2154). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALLECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3561. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Harrison County, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2155). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3570. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Port Allegany borough, Liberty Township, in the county of McKean, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 2156). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3571. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 2157). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8491. A bill authorizing the county of Knox, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2158). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8589. A bill to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2159). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8749. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Petersburg, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2160). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9094. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Winona, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2161). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9261. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2162). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WADSWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9411. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2163). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 2191. An Act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the Montana School of Mines a patent to a certain tract of land; without amendment (Rept. No. 2164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6559. A bill to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Olympic National Park, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DeROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 9274. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 669); without amend-

ment (Rept. No. 2166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TARVER: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 9007. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4656. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Esther Klein; with amendment (Rept. No. 2146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5926. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Marie Eglick; without amendment (Rept. No. 2147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6765. A bill to authorize cancellation of deportation in the case of Ramon Zapien; without amendment (Rept. No. 2148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7178. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Baur; with amendment (Rept. No. 2149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stefanida Szewczuk-Omelchuk (Kovalcik); with amendment (Rept. No. 2150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 8551. A bill for the relief of Xenophon George Panos; with amendment (Rept. No. 2151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TALLE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Bessie Singer Weinman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TALLE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6888. A bill for the relief of Esther Jacobs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 8744. A bill for the relief of Ernest Lyle Greenwood and Phyllis Joy Greenwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 2169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9373) granting a pension to Thomas Green, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 9743. A bill authorizing Alabama Bridge Commission (an agency of the State of Alabama) to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and causeway between Dauphin Island and the mainland at or near Cedar Point, within the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 9744. A bill to permit extension of credit to foreign governments in certain cases notwithstanding limitations imposed under existing law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 9745. A bill to authorize preliminary examination and survey of Indian River, Upper St. Johns River and marsh, and north fork, St. Lucie River and their tributaries in the State of Florida for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 9746. A bill to authorize percentage increases in computing the retired pay of certain retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps for active duty performed subsequent to retirement; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 9747. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 9748. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of a channel through Johns Pass; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 9749. A bill establishing the United States Naval Academy police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 9750. A bill to utilize the idle monetary stocks of the United States for the public benefit and the promotion of recovery; to make loans available at low interest for public works, the construction, repair, and modernization of homes, and the rehabilitation of agriculture; to stimulate the building trades and the capital goods industries, to promote farm ownership, and to provide employment for the unemployed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 9751. A bill for the creation of the United States De Soto Exposition Commission to provide for the commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Mississippi River by Hernando De Soto, the commemoration of De Soto's visit to the Chickasaw Territory in northern Mississippi, and other points covered by his expedition, and the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 542. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Maryland and West Virginia, and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia as signatory bodies, to enter into a compact for the creation of a Potomac Valley Conservancy District and the establishment of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. Res. 491. Resolution authorizing an appropriation for the select committee authorized by House Resolution 63; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution No. 29, with reference to House bill 8748 and Senate bill 3509, concerning farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Resolution No. 46, with reference to House bill 8748 and Senate bill 3509, concerning farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the

United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14, relating to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 9752. A bill for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 9753. A bill for the relief of the Magnolia Realty Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 9754. A bill for the relief of George M. Louie; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 9755. A bill for the relief of Joseph, Bertha, and Beatrice Millard or Milrot; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 9756. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nellie Merriman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 9757. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Margaret Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 9758. A bill granting an increase of pension to Barbara Nowak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 9759. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Elfriede Lewin; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 9760. A bill for the relief of Evert E. Glover; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 9761. A bill for the relief of Burl Threadgill and Helen Threadgill; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8214. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of sundry citizens of Beloit and Janesville, Wis., opposing Senate bill 3480, known as the Gillette Farm Credit Act of 1940; to the Select Committee on Government Organization.

8215. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Beloit, Wis., favoring Senate bill 3509, the Wheeler-Bankhead and La Follette Farm Credit Act of 1940; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8216. Also, petition of the Polish Relief Fund Committee of Milwaukee, endorsing House bill 8654, authorizing \$20,000,000 for the relief of the civilian population of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8217. By Mr. COLE of Maryland: Petition of Lt. George B. Redwood Post, No. 133, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of Baltimore, Md., urging passage of House bill 9000, to provide pensions for the widows and dependents of all World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

8218. By Mr. COLLINS: Resolution of the Mississippi State Legislature, memorializing Congress to pass the Wheeler-Jones bill scaling down farm mortgages and reducing the interest rate; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8219. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Essex County Engineering Society of New Jersey, requesting that recommendations by the Board of Army Engineers relative to flood control in the Passaic River Valley be held in abeyance until such time as the officials and interested parties have had an opportunity to review and discuss the report of the Board of Army Engineers; to the Committee on Flood Control.

8220. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Port of New York Authority, opposing action of the Federal

Government contemplated to press its claim to the right to take without compensation lands and improvements located thereon below low-water mark as well as reclaimed lands and improvements thereon, property which the courts have consistently held are owned by the States or their grantees; the proposed suit, if brought, will be against the city of Los Angeles to expropriate Reeves' Field Airport in that city, which the Navy Department is reported to desire as a fleet base; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

8221. Also, petition of the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights, opposing actions of the Dies committee investigating un-American activities; to the Committee on Rules.

8222. Also, petition of the American Defense Society, Inc., urging enactment of certain legislation governing aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8223. Also, petition of Local Union No. 3, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of Greater New York and Vicinity, protesting the procedure of the Department of Justice in prosecuting certain labor unions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8224. Also, petition of the New York State Federation of Labor, representing all unions of workmen in the State of New York affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, comprising a total membership of 1,100,000, favoring the Norton bill (H. R. 9195), proposing amendment to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

8225. Also, petition of the Welfare Council of New York City, urging that the Wagner-Steagall amendments to the United States housing law, which has already passed the Senate, be reported out of committee promptly and passed by the House; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8226. Also, petition of the Citizens' Housing Council of New York, urging immediate enactment of the Wagner housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8227. Also, petition of the City-Wide Tenants' Council of New York City, urging immediate enactment of the Wagner housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8228. Also, petition of the Draper-Atlas Poultry Corporation, favoring enactment of Senate bill 2753, which would allow the shippers of perishable products throughout the country to continue the selecting of proper and efficient railroad refrigerator car equipment for the transporting of their perishable products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8229. Also, petition of the State of New York Department of Social Welfare, of Albany, favoring immediate enactment of the Wagner-Byrne bill (S. 3783 and H. R. 8985), which would relieve State employees of the retroactive and discriminatory burden which may be placed upon them by way of retroactive personal income taxation because their salaries were paid in part from Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8230. Also, petition of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, opposing transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce; to the Select Committee on Government Organization.

8231. Also, petition of the New York Mercantile Exchange, urging action on the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill during this Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8232. Also, petition of the American Federation of Municipal Transit Workers, Local 21193, American Federation of Labor, urging enactment of the Norton bill (H. R. 9195), containing amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

8233. Also, petition of the Employees' Committee from Lower Manhattan, urging that the Congress institute a review of the Securities Act of 1933 and 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8234. Also, petition of the executive board of the District of Columbia League of Women Voters, approving the provisions of House bill 9138; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8235. Also, petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, favoring unemployment compensation benefit provision of House bills 9218 and 9619, especially \$20 for 20 weeks and 1 week waiting period; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8236. Also, petition of Palm Fechteler & Co., of New York City, urging immediate enactment of the Maloney bill (H. R. 8893); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8237. Also, petition of the Washington Board of Trade, favoring enactment of House bill 9619, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8238. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the City-Wide Tenants' Council, New York City, favoring the passage of the Wagner bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8239. By Mr. PFELFER: Petition of the Real Estate Association of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., concerning the housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8240. Also, petition of the Citizens' Housing Council of New York, New York City, concerning the housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8241. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the American Federation of Municipal Transit Workers, Local 21193, American Federation of Labor, New York City, favoring the Norton amendment to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

8242. Also, petition of the Citizens' Housing Council of New York, New York City, favoring the passage of the Wagner bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8243. Also, petition of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing all amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

8244. By Mr. SPRINGER: Resolution of GM Sub Council, No. 4, U. A. A., C. I. O., Muncie, Ind., pertaining to the use of the Espionage Act and agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by certain employers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8245. By Mr. WOOD: Petition of Isaac L. Turner and others to Senators and Congressmen from Missouri, requesting that House bill 8264 be brought before the Senate and House of Representatives and passed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8246. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Labor's Non-Partisan League, Fifty-fourth Assembly District, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

8247. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Chrysler Local No. 371, New Castle, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8248. Also, petition of the presbytery of Chester, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Glenolden, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the appointment by the President of a personal representative at the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8249. Also, petition of Mrs. W. T. Rands, Townsend Club, No. 1, Superior, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 8264, referred to as the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8250. Also, petition of Labor's Nonpartisan League Club, No. 2, 51 A. D. in California, Ada Y. Kreitzberg, secretary, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9275, known as a bill to require registration of certain organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8251. Also, petition of the United Automobile Workers of America, Local No. 95, Janesville, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591,

United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8252. Also, petition of the International Workers Order, Southern California District, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

8253. Also, petition of Local 581, International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Flint, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8254. Also, petition of Local 430, United Automobile Workers of America, affiliated with Congress of Industrial Organizations, Richmond, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1940

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 24, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou at whose command light first sprang from darkness, send light into our souls, we pray, lest some cherished sin close Thine ears to our petitions. Let the breath of Thy spirit's calm breathe upon us, disturbing our pride, our apathy, cleansing us from moral pollution, stirring our sterile natures into fruitfulness, winning a plenteous harvest of high and holy living, so necessary to our calling if we would serve this people with courage and fidelity, for we know that the strength of one whose heart is pure is as the strength of ten.

Be merciful to all who need Thy mercy; let the angel of Thy presence save the oppressed and the afflicted. Be Thou the strength of the weary, the comfort of the sorrowful, the friend of the desolate, the hope of the dying, and to our agonizing world be an ever-present help, through Him whose love will one day conquer all, even Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, May 13, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 3251) to amend sections 16 and 17 of chapter II of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9000. An act to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9114. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of a recorder of deeds building in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9299. An act to amend section 10 of chapter 5 of Public Act No. 436, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 9576. An act relating to the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of persons resident or domiciled in the Virgin Islands of the United States;

H. R. 9633. An act to enlarge and extend the power and jurisdiction of the Board of Education over degree-conferring institutions operating within the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 9722. An act to provide for the regulation of the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to provide for participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition at San Francisco in 1940, to continue the powers and duties of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes," approved July 9, 1937, to provide for participation in the New York World's Fair, 1940, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

AIR MAIL AND AUTOGIRO SHUTTLE SERVICES, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitted pursuant to law, on the question of experimental services in the transportation of the mails by air, including autogiro aircraft shuttle service between outlying airports and central areas, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORT ON EMORY AND OBED RIVERS, TENN.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 261 (submitted by Mr. McKellar, and agreed to May 9, 1940), a copy of the report of the district engineer, Corps of Engineers of the Army, at the Nashville, Tenn., district, reviewing the report on the Tennessee River and tributaries with a view to determining what improvement of the Obed River is advisable in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from Orville P. Clark, national president of the National Association of Postal Mechanics, Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 892) to extend to custodial-service employees employed by the Post Office Department certain benefits applicable to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial signed by S. W. Hopkins and sundry other pilots of the Chicago & Southern Airlines, New Orleans, La., remonstrating against adoption of the President's Reorganization Plan No. IV, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution of Post No. 1, War Veterans Civic Association, of Fall River, Mass., favoring the inclusion of a provision in the W. P. A. appropriation joint resolution giving preference to both married and single veterans and the widows of veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a resolution of Quincy Post, No. 95, American Legion, of Quincy, Mass., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 9000) to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Medford, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 9000) to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of Braintree Post, No. 86, American Legion, of Braintree, Mass., favoring the location of a general medical hospital and diagnostic center in Boston or in the vicinity thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.